NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

THESIS

AUTHORITARIANISM IN TURKEY

by

Clifford W. Anderson

September 2014

Thesis Advisor:	Tristan J. Mabry
Second Reader:	Victoria S. Clement

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			*Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188*
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instruction, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188) Washington DC 20503.			
1. AGENCY USE ONLY *(Leave blank)*	**2. REPORT DATE** September 2014	**3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED** Master's Thesis	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE AUTHORITARIANISM IN TURKEY			**5. FUNDING NUMBERS**
6. AUTHOR(S) Clifford W. Anderson			
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000			**8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER**
9. SPONSORING /MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			**10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER**
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government. IRB protocol number: __N/A_____			
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited			**12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE** A

13. ABSTRACT (maximum 200 words)

Turkey is a member of NATO and has long been upheld by the West as proof that a Muslim-majority state can maintain a stable democracy. However, the current regime seeks to establish executive power over the judiciary in a move that would violate the separation of powers. This demonstrates an attempt by the ruling Justice and Development Party (AKP) to subjugate the state without oversight from other parties or branches of government. As constitutional talks have broken down and no new draft is scheduled, any attempt to institutionalize a new system of government has met with failure. Executive decrees and legislation indicate this regime's authoritarian proclivities, which have precluded EU membership despite initial efforts to the contrary. This thesis applies the authoritarian models of Juan Linz to examine Turkey's political system. Results indicate Turkey should be classified as an authoritarian state, both before and after the rise of the AKP.

14. SUBJECT TERMS authoritarianism, Turkey, Islamism			**15. NUMBER OF PAGES** 99
			16. PRICE CODE
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	**18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE** Unclassified	**19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT** Unclassified	**20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT** UU

NSN 7540-01-280-5500

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 2-89)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. 239-18

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

AUTHORITARIANISM IN TURKEY

Clifford W. Anderson
Major, United States Air Force
B.A., Virginia Wesleyan College, 1997
M.A., Old Dominion University, 2001

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

**MASTER OF ARTS IN SECURITY STUDIES
(MIDDLE EAST, SOUTH ASIA, SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA)**

from the

**NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
September 2014**

Author: Clifford W. Anderson

Approved by: Tristan J. Mabry
       Thesis Advisor

       Victoria S. Clement
       Second Reader

       Mohammed M. Hafez
       Chair, Department of National Security Affairs

iii

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ABSTRACT

Turkey is a member of NATO and has long been upheld by the West as proof that a Muslim-majority state can maintain a stable democracy. However, the current regime seeks to establish executive power over the judiciary in a move that would violate the separation of powers. This demonstrates an attempt by the ruling Justice and Development Party (AKP) to subjugate the state without oversight from other parties or branches of government. As constitutional talks have broken down and no new draft is scheduled, any attempt to institutionalize a new system of government has met with failure. Executive decrees and legislation indicate this regime's authoritarian proclivities, which have precluded EU membership despite initial efforts to the contrary. This thesis applies the authoritarian models of Juan Linz to examine Turkey's political system. Results indicate Turkey should be classified as an authoritarian state, both before and after the rise of the AKP.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AKP	*Adalet ve Kalkinma Partisi*: Justice and Development Party
CHP	*Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi*: Republican People's Party
EU	European Union
KKP	*Partiya Karkeren Kurdistan*: Kurdistan Workers' Party
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
U.S.	United States of America

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I. THESIS PROPOSAL

A. TURKEY: A SHIFTING PARADIGM?

Turkey has long stood as a favored example of modern, secular, and democratic government in the Middle East and the Muslim World. However, recent actions and statements by leaders of the Justice and Development Party (AKP) have cast Turkey's status as such an example into doubt. As the reign of the AKP has progressed, high-level leaders (Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan in particular) have attempted to alter the workings of the Turkish government to match Islamist party agendas (restriction of alcohol sales and social media are prominent examples).[1] As a result, Turkey's status as a liberal democracy is threatened. In the past, an extra check on the executive existed in the form of the Turkish military. If any regime deviated too far from secular Kemalist doctrine, the military would remove it via coup and establish a new government that would eventually revert to civilian leadership. Although this military infringement upon government was not internationally accepted as a rightful function of democratic government, it did supplement a system of checks and balances. Now that military power has been subordinated to civilian government under the AKP, the checks and balances of civilian government are all that prevent any one branch or regime from exceeding its mandate. Power balances between parties and branches of government are required to prevent systemic breakdown.

Governmental legitimacy only arises out of consensus of the governed, and this consensus must be institutionalized by law, constitution, and politics to allow lasting stability. While some maintain that constitutions may be the only lasting imprints of these dynamics in states that experience regular governmental change,[2] laws and decrees must be examined to determine the application of any charter. The behavior of a regime

---

[1] "Not so Good for You," *The Economist*, June 1, 2013, http://www.economist.com/news/europe/21578657-mildly-islamist-government-brings-tough-alcohol-restrictions-not-so-good-you; Eliana Dockterman, "Turkey Bans Twitter," *TIME*, March 20, 2014, accessed April 5, 2014, http://time.com/32864/turkey-bans-twitter/.

[2] Markuu Suksi, *Bringing in the People: A Comparison of Constitutional Forms and Practices of the Referendum* (Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1993), 5–6.

towards these institutions and domestic competitors for power can be analyzed to determine agenda and nature. Examination of such behavior may reveal whether or not the AKP and Turkey are entering an era of authoritarianism.

B.   MAJOR RESEARCH QUESTION

Turkey's model of government may be threatened by executive ambition and party politics, and its military no longer appears able to act against such ambition. Meanwhile, the rest of the Muslim world observes developments in a state that some consider a regional hegemon, and various actors weigh their options. This thesis seeks to answer the following question: is the AKP transforming Turkey into an authoritarian state?

C.   IMPORTANCE

Turkey is a member of NATO and has long been upheld by the West as proof that a Muslim-majority state with variable constituents can achieve stable democracy and legitimacy. Turkey's current leadership managed to hamstring the military's ability to perform juntas via infiltration and prosecution. Now, it seeks to establish presidential power over the judiciary in a move that would violate the separation of powers and indicate an attempt to subjugate the state to the AKP's agenda without oversight from other parties or branches. As constitutional talks have broken down and no re-write is scheduled, any attempt to institutionalize a new system has met with failure on the constitutional front.[3] Executive decrees and legislation indicate this regime's authoritarian proclivities, which have precluded EU membership despite initial efforts to the contrary. Continuation along this path will result in further isolation from the West, but the maintenance of power in Turkey is arguably the AKP's first priority.

Said Amir Arjomand cites conventional wisdom in calling constitutions "complexes of rules" rather than monolithic structures.[4] More importantly, he dubs them "shorthand commentary on the ongoing discourse among the actors in the political

---

[3] Gulsen Solaker, "Hopes Fade for a New Turkish Constitution," Reuters, November 18, 2013, http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/11/18/us-turkey-constitution-idUSBRE9AH0OV20131118.

[4] Said Amir Arjomand, *Constitutionalism and political reconstruction* (Boston: Brill, 2007), 195–196.

process at the time of the constitutional compromise."[5] The efforts of the AKP to rewrite Turkey's constitution indicate an understanding of the need to enshrine a new ideology and institutionalize a new system of power in order to maintain control. Prior to the March 2014 parliamentary elections, legislative opposition, judicial defiance, and scandals assured that the AKP did not have enough support to complete such an operation. It remains to be seen whether this will change in the new term.

The actions of the AKP threaten to compromise the country's status as a "moderate" Muslim state. The nature of Turkey's government and its delineated powers are at issue as the judiciary and the police clash with the agenda of the AKP. As the AKP attempts to replace Kemalism with progressive and Islamist ideologies as the basis for the Turkish state, volatility is to be expected. Given ongoing conflict in Syria and recent instability in Egypt, the regional stability of the Middle East may be greatly affected by governmental changes in Turkey. As the crossroads between Europe and Asia, and the most powerful state in the region, the direction of the power and resources brought to bear by Turkey is primary in regional affairs. While Turkey remains a democracy for the moment, its status as a liberal democracy may have been compromised. While attempted constitutional rewrites have met with failure, the AKP has not been shy about proceeding unilaterally. In the past, military intervention has derailed regimes that attempted to alter the base system of governance in Turkey. It could be argued that this preserved democracy in the state, as the military did cede power to the civilian population after each such intervention. Immediate reforms are in progress, and the nature of Turkey's government and state are at stake. The outcome will likely alter international relationships, and will certainly affect regional stability. What occurs will affect U.S. foreign policy in the region for decades to come.

D.   HYPOTHESIS

This study hypothesizes that recent attempts at constitutional revision in Turkey indicate an attempt by the AKP to institutionalize an authoritarian agenda. This attempt stands with the AKP's unilateral executive actions and attempts to seize power from law-

---

[5] Ibid.

enforcement and the judiciary, the latter being an attempt to tip the balance of power in the AKP's favor. The latter violation of power-separation indicates authoritarian behavior and represents an attempt to neutralize the check exercised by entities that cannot be pacified with power-sharing as other political parties might be. To argue this, Juan Linz's theory of mobilizational authoritarian government will be tested against the case of Turkey, with the nature of its regime as the variable.[6]

E.   LITERATURE REVIEW

The theory of mobilizational authoritarian government is presented in Juan Linz's book *Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes* and accompanied by several case studies. There are several scholarly works that address the nature of authoritarian government, including both journal articles and books. A theory that appears to accurately describe the stage that the AKP has brought Turkey to is Levitsky and Way's theory of competitive authoritarianism.[7] General background literature on the development of democracy in Turkey and the region is plentiful.[8]

1.   Authoritarianism

John Duckitt's 1989 article on group identification sets the stage for modern discussion on the nature of authoritarianism. Many of the publications that follow it borrow from the normative framework Duckitt provides for authoritarianism as a concept that defines the perceived "appropriate relationship between group and individual member, determined primarily by the intensity of group identification and consequent

---

[6] Juan Linz, *Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 2000).

[7] Steven Levitsky and Lucan Way, "Elections without Democracy: The Rise of Competitive Authoritarianism," *Journal of Democracy* 13, no. 2 (April 2002): 51–65.

[8] Fevzi Bilgin, *Constitution, Legitimacy and Democracy in Turkey*, SSRN Scholarly Paper (Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network, 2008), http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=1564920; Ahmet Kuru and Alfred Stepan, eds., *Democracy, Islam, and Secularism in Turkey* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012); Ergun Özbudun, *Democratization and the Politics of Constitution-Making in Turkey* (Central European University Press, 2009); William Hale and Ergun Özbudun, *Islamism, Democracy and Liberalism in Turkey: The Case of the AKP* (Oxon, England: Routledge, 2010); Kemal Karpat, *Social Change and Politics in Turkey: A Structural-Historical Analysis* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973); John M. Vanderlippe, *The Politics of Turkish Democracy: Ismet Inonu and the Formation of the Multi-Party System, 1938–1950* (Albany: New York State University Press, 2005).

strain toward cohesion."[9] This approach eschews the personality dimension that had been central to authoritarian theory during prior years, and focuses on the attitudes of the group in order differentiate authoritarianism from like practices (such as conservatism). This makes the approach seminal for divining intergroup behaviors like the ones to be tested in this thesis. However, its limitation is that it discounts the relevance of individual behavior.[10]

Approximately a decade prior, Amos Perlmutter introduced his models of authoritarianism, which break the phenomenon down by type. In describing authoritarianism as a whole, he characterizes it as dependent upon political elites and popular support.[11] To clarify, the populace must be mobilized behind an authoritarian cause for it to function. This does not preclude exclusive and restrictive actions on the part of the regime, but the regime still requires popular support to exist.[12] Perlmutter divides authoritarian regimes amongst party states, police states, corporatist states and praetorian states. His definitions of party and police states are in keeping with the titles, but corporatism refers to oligarchy and praetorianism to military in Perlmutter's view.[13] This can be contrasted with the work of Samuel Huntington, who expands praetorianism to include several other institutions besides the military.[14] Perlmutter's defining characteristic of authoritarianism is the need for ideology to institutionalize it into political structures. For this reason, he sees corporatist and praetorian regimes as doomed to fail due to an inability to mobilize support or achieve political stability.[15]

Stellmacher and Petzel introduced a more specific and inclusive model of authoritarianism. This model of "group authoritarianism" combined Duckitt's concept

---

[9] John Duckitt, "Authoritarianism and Group Identification: A New View of an Old Construct," *Political Psychology* 10, no. 1 (March 1989): 63.

[10] Ibid., 81–82.

[11] Amos Perlmutter, *Modern Authoritarianism: A Comparative Institutional Analysis* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1981), 1–2.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Ibid., 28-51.

[14] Samuel Huntington, *Political Order in Changing Societies* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968), 194.

[15] Perlmutter, *Modern Authoritarianism*, 174-176.

with the traditional authoritarian personality concepts and "social identity theory."[16] It reflects the same dynamic as Duckitt's theory in that belief about the appropriateness of group-individual relationships is addressed. The difference lies in the proposal that specific situations activate authoritarian dispositions depending upon the values of the group in question. Most often, occurrences that threaten the group catalyze authoritarian behaviors. Individual proclivities are not discounted, and intergroup authoritarian behaviors are distinguished from intragroup authoritarian behaviors.[17] Such a model of authoritarianism seems more plausible and applicable than Duckitt's, but does not necessarily lend itself to situations in which ruling or incumbent parties are not threatened by credible domestic or international threats.

It is important to distinguish between authoritarianism and totalitarianism for the purposes of characterizing any regime. This is perhaps best accomplished by Juan Linz in his work "Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes." In this book, he defines an authoritarian regime as one that enforces limited and controlled participation in government by the populace. This results in the apathy of the majority of citizens towards politics. One type of regime that Linz describes is the "bureaucratic-military-technocratic" regime. Under such a regime, there are limited ways for the majority of citizens to participate in government, and their rulers have little or no interest in even limited or manipulated participation. Another described typology is the mobilizational authoritarian regime, which mobilizes the citizenry to its ends via monopolized channels of participation created by the leadership of the regime. Most often, this system is characterized by one-party workings, and although such parties are not founded for the express purpose of excluding other interests from politics and do not monopolize all workings of government, Linz still labels it authoritarian.[18]

Mobilizational authoritarianism consists of two different types. The first describes a system in which a successful party survives a state-wide struggle for independence

---

[16] Jost Stellmacher and Thomas Petzel, "Authoritarianism as a Group Phenomenon," *Political Pshychology: Authoritarianism*, 26, no. 2 (April 2005): 245–249.

[17] Ibid., 261–263.

[18] Juan J. Linz, *Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 2000), 176.

from foreign domination and becomes pre-eminent. In so developing, the party thereafter protects its leading position by eliminating rights and freedoms that would permit competition, or absorbing such competition into the fold. It can accomplish this due to the extreme level of mobilization required to have established a ruling party during the independence process. The second addresses mobilizational regimes found in post democratic civilizations, in which bureaucratic-military or elitist regimes cannot dominate. This inability results from widespread expectation among the populace that political participation will be extended to all citizens. The situation required to produce such a regime is unusual enough that a coup d'état is not sufficient to allow exclusion of those segments in opposition. Mass mobilization of diverse interests follows in order to subdue traditional elements that would thwart such a movement (army or church). This results in a pre-totalitarian regime that, at the time, can be dubbed exclusionary mobilizational authoritarianism.[19]

The "competitive authoritarianism" model of Levitsky and Way asserts that a unique, hybrid form of government serves as a sort of waypoint between authoritarianism and democracy for regimes in transition. Alternatively, the hybrid government in question may embrace formal instruments of democracy, such as elections, while still engaging in authoritarian government. The criteria that the authors examine in determining a regime's qualification are free and fair elections, voting rights, civil rights, political rights, and government freedom from religion or military. They expand the category of civil liberties to include freedom of the press, and they do it to an extent that implies that any regime that interferes in social media must be authoritarian.[20] While the control of newspapers is traditionally addressed by this paradigm, social media now enters the scene as well.[21]

It is also necessary to consider the relationship between religiosity and authoritarianism. Wink, Dillon, and Prettyman conducted a study using longitudinal data

---

[19] Ibid., 176–177.

[20] Steven Levitsky and Lucan Way, "Elections without Democracy: The Rise of Competitive Authoritarianism," *Journal of Democracy* 13, no. 2 (2002): 52–54.

[21] Eliana Dockterman, "Turkey Bans Twitter," *TIME*, accessed April 5, 2014, http://time.com/32864/turkey-bans-twitter/.

to determine correlation between these tendencies in adults. Although the study was conducted within Christian populations, the findings should be applicable to any group demonstrating strong attitudes towards out-groups.[22] Ultimately, their findings demonstrated correlation (but not causation) between religious involvement in early adulthood and authoritarianism in later life. Conversely, "spiritual-seeking" in early adulthood was found to indicate anti-authoritarianism in later life.[23] The diametrically opposed results indicate difficulty in associating any religious platforms with authoritarianism because it is difficult to identify party members or supporters as either religious or spiritual seeking.

A study that did claim causation was conducted by Frederick Solt and offered an explanation of the social origins of authoritarianism. The findings of the study suggest that economic inequality leads to or reinforces authoritarian behavior by the wealthy and acceptance by the poor due to relative power. The basis for the conclusion lies in material power influencing views of hierarchical relations,[24] but the application in terms of a regime that successfully mitigates income equality is dubious. If one believes Solt's theory, such a regime must lessen popular acceptance of authoritarian behavior, and it would likely maintain electoral control and a solid plurality of voters.

The work of Larry Diamond on the model of the "Rule of Law Versus the Big Man" explains the historical dominance of personal rule by political strong men and one party systems. Writing primarily about African governments, he explains that this dominance has been based upon neopatrimonial governments that operated to produce private rather than public goods, creating extensive corruption, crony-capitalism, and nepotism. Diamond refers to the effects as the "deadening hand of personal rule," and is extremely concerned with the effect of "stubborn personalism" on state development. In his region of expertise, democracies have apparently turned the tide (by number), so

---

[22] Paul Wink, Michele Dillon, and Adrienne Prettyman, "Religiousness, Spiritual Seeking, and Authoritarianism: Findings from a Longitudinal Study," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 46, no. 3 (2007): 321–322.

[23] Ibid., 332–333.

[24] Frederick Solt, "The Social Origins of Authoritarianism," *Political Research Quarterly* 65, no. 4 (2012): 703–705.

Diamond addresses the course of the region with optimism.[25] However, there is nothing to rule out the possibility of the "Big Man" rearing his head elsewhere.

Less relevant to this study is the work of Erika Weinthal and Pauline Jones Luong in examining the impact of natural resources on authoritarian government. Their theory explains that while mineral rich states often experience economic inequality and authoritarian government, it is possible to mitigate these problems through domestic privatization of the mineral resources in question. Citing the example of Russia, the authors claim that weak state institutions can be circumvented by this solution because eliminating state control over natural resources leads to an environ conducive to the building of strong state institutions and also provides government the impetus to do so. Theoretically, this change results from enacting regulation to gain control over these resources. Weinthal and Luong caution that their solution is not for the short term and that institution building of any kind is a lengthy process. Once they are built, however, these institutions can convert mineral wealth into societal well-being.[26]

2.   The Middle East and Democracy

In reference to liberal thought in the eastern Mediterranean during the Modern period, Christoph Shumann offered:

> Freedom of expression and opinion was included in most constitutions of the pre-revolutionary era. Although these constitutions have been suspended time and again, ever since the Ottoman constitution was established in 1876, the principle of constitutionalism, once introduced, has never been seriously called into question. Today, opposition movements throughout the region, far from requiring the abolition or amendment of constitutions, demand the removal of restorations imposed on them.[27]

---

[25] Larry Diamond, "The Rule of Law Versus the Big Man," *Journal of Democracy* 19, no. 2 (2008): 138–149.

[26] Weinthal and Luong, "An Alternative Solution to Managing Mineral Wealth," *Perspectives on Politics 4*, no. 1 (2006): 35–53.

[27] Christoph Shumann, *Liberal Thought in the Eastern Mediterranean Late 19th Century until the 1960s*: *Social, Economic, and Political Studies of the Middle East and Asia* (Boston: Brill, 2008), 1–2.

Schumann posits the emergence and decline of liberal thought in the eastern Mediterranean region from the late 19th century through the 1960s. He also believes that Islam is not primary in determining the region's political culture, citing the specific history of states instead.[28] This implies that he prizes the effect of imperialism on state development more than that of indigenous ideology.

Prior to the Arab Spring, Steven Cook wrote a book attempting to explain why authoritarian regimes appeared to have achieved stability in the Middle East. Part of his explanation was that a stalemate had been reached between Islamism, the military, and the state. In constructing this explanation, he mentioned Turkey, Egypt, and Algeria as states where the military "ruled without governing," which is also the title of his work. This was a way to express the stewardship that the militaries exercised over their states in thwarting hostile takeover. He cited Clement Henry Moore in saying that the movements that swept these states during struggles for independence included "liberal assimilationist, traditional anti-colonialist, and radical nationalist moments sequentially."[29] Turkey, as the oldest of these republics, and one emerging from imperialism as a former colonizer, traversed these stages more quickly and reached constitutional statehood without having to compose its charter in the midst of these throes. Additionally, it had the shortest history of European dominance. Egypt and Algeria, however, became mired in nationalism and their constitutions were conceived in this atmosphere, leading to military dominance and situations necessitating it. Cook also treated how each government used Islam, but claimed that governmental forms did not hinge upon this.[30]

Others saw a different stalemate as responsible for evolving governments in the Middle East. Frédéric Volpi believed that the opposition between doctrines of liberalism, republicanism, and Islamism led to "Pseudo-democracy in the Muslim world."[31] At the same time, he explicitly identified these governments as not just failures of liberal

---

[28] Ibid., 2–4.

[29] Steven A. Cook, *Ruling But Not Governing: The Military and Political Development in Egypt, Algeria, and Turkey* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007), 10.

[30] Ibid., xi, 10–12.

[31] Frédéric Volpi, "Pseudo-democracy in the Muslim world," *Third World Quarterly* 25, no. 6 (2004): http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/3993751?uid=2129&uid=2&uid=70&uid=4&sid=21103477816641.

democracy, but also developments based upon "alternative notions of democracy."[32] What he found unique to the region was the attempt to employ democracy while engaging in illiberal social mobilization and educational practices that were more efficient than those used in typical democratic states.[33] The resulting mechanisms produced systems alien to the West, and ones so illiberal as to appear undemocratic.

Not all have found the stalemate to be ongoing. In 1984, Said Amir Arjomand cataloged what he believed to be the region-wide shift from nationalism to Islamism well before the events of the Arab Spring. He believed that Islamism was becoming the primary ideology of the region, and that nations would fundamentally change as a result.[34] Twenty-eight years later, the latter conclusion has been proven correct. The primary ideology of the region remains a matter for debate, but Turkey's system of government is undergoing a shift that may lead it away from secularism and liberalism.

If such a shift is in progress, Turkey's government needs to take certain steps to ensure stability. According to Carles Boix and Milan Svolik, an authoritarian regime's failure to institutionalize power sharing will lead to instability and rebellion. Their work on the subject asserts that such a regime needs to establish a ruling coalition with extra-party allies in order to mitigate threat of rebellion. They claim that should such a threat's credibility fail, institutions will break down. The authoritarian government can only take advantage of the arrangement if it has managed to tip the balance of power far enough in its favor to create an environment conducive to dominance. Therefore, the theory effectively postulates that any imbalance of power, without institutions to pacify competitors, will cause factional conflict and lead to instability in authoritarian regimes.[35] This theory appears to apply to Turkey given seemingly authoritarian behavior on the part of its current government. However, the part of the equation that is still a nominal variable is the nature of the regime rather than credible threat of rebellion or

---

[32] Ibid., 1061.

[33] Ibid., 1061–1078.

[34] Said Amir Arjomand, *From Nationalism to Revolutionary Islam* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1984), 1–5.

[35] Carles Boix and Milan Svolik, "The Foundations of Limited Authoritarian Government: Institutions, Commitment, and Power-Sharing in Dictatorships," *The Journal of Politics* 75, no. 2 (2013): 300–316.

institutionalization of power sharing. Regular protests provide the former, and while the constitution accomplishes the latter to the satisfaction of the Kemalists, it does not satisfy the AKP.

F. METHODS AND SOURCES

Primary methodology for this thesis will be the application of the theory of mobilizational authoritarian government to the case of the AKP's regime in Turkey. If the AKP's actions match authoritarian qualities detailed in the theory, then a move towards totalitarian government is indicated regardless of the success of such actions. Further research for this thesis will include an examination of the Turkish constitution to determine whether it blocks the agenda of the AKP, and an examination of recent rewrite attempts to determine whether or not these attempts fit the mold of institutionalizing authoritarianism. Additionally, AKP legislation and executive decrees will be analyzed to determine if separation of powers violations indicate a move towards illiberal government. Finally, the sum of the findings shall be synthesized to determine the status of Turkey's current government as liberal or authoritarian.

Turkey's 1984 constitution will be examined, although scholarly characterization of Turkey's governmental history will be addressed as necessary to determine if the AKP's agenda is actually different from that of past regimes. Subsequent amendments and harmonization packages will also be addressed. Materials for this research will include scholarly articles, books, online periodicals, and the data of survey organizations. The material will consist of English-language sources.

G. THESIS OVERVIEW

This thesis will commence with an introduction covering the purpose of this study and its importance followed by a literature review of authoritarianism. The second chapter will provide a background of the development of Turkey's current political situation, along with a treatment of authoritarianism and Turkey. This section is necessary to establish a point of origin for the current regime, and how the development of the party has come into conflict with the establishing ideology of the Republic of Turkey.

The third chapter will transition to an examination of the AKP's rise to power and its recent attempts to alter government systems. Chapter IV will treat how the theory of mobilizational authoritarianism can be applied to Turkey and the AKP. Chapter V will address the constitutional mandate of Turkey along with how the AKP has exceeded it, and what the party desires to change via revision. This will allow the juxtaposition of authoritarianism and constitutional separation of powers in Turkey, and allow evaluation of the AKP's larger movement and direction.

Chapter VI will address the ramifications of the findings in the prior chapters, and synthesize the authoritarian actions and separations of power that are determining Turkey's course into a characterization of its developing regime as authoritarian or not. This will forecast long-term developments for liberal democracy in the state and the region. The continuing dance between the EU and Turkey appears to have stagnated at this juncture, and may no longer be a useful indicator of potential relations between Turkey and the West. Although Turkey still belongs to NATO, future orientation might be inferred from how the Justice and Development party shares power or grabs it.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

II.   HISTORY OF AUTHORITARIANISM IN TURKEY

On 20 March, 2014, Prime Minister Erdogan of Turkey banned the use of the social media program "Twitter" in his country. Calling social media "society's worst menace," Erdogan's motives appeared transparent, as the program had been used to leak recordings implicating him in a corruption scandal. The ability to engage in such a ban or curtail civil liberties for the personal purposes of an individual ruler indicates the presence of an authoritarian government. This chapter will examine the history of authoritarianism in Turkey to determine if the behaviors of Erdogan and the AKP are a departure from recent Turkish civic traditions because they are authoritarian. To accomplish this, the origins of Turkish authoritarianism will be examined during the period of the Ottoman Empire. The chapter will then transition to modernization reforms that linked the Ottomans to their successor state of Turkey, along with how these reforms culminated in Kemalism and its platforms. This will be followed by an authoritarian characterization of Mustafa Kemal's reign, of the system he created for Turkey, and of the military that guarded it. The section will conclude with characterizations of Turkish politics as they now exist, and how they are perceived in the modern media.

Turkey remains an electoral democracy for the moment, has embraced secularism for the majority of its existence, and has had friendly relations with the West since World War II. Of the revolutionary republics in the Middle East, it has the longest life span. Does this mean that Turkey stands as an example of a successful representative state if no longer a *liberal* democracy? Ergun Özbudun does not think so. He describes the many iterations of the Turkish constitution as "a series of missed opportunities to create political institutions based on broad consensus."[36] The implication is that Turkey's constitution fails to institutionalize the sharing of power in such a way as to allow for a lasting consensus. He also claims that because none of the republican constitutions of 1924, 1962, or 1982 were created by an assembly representative of the whole population, they were therefore not the result of consensus and that political legitimacy did not

---

[36] Ergun Özbudun and Ömer Faruk Gençkaya, *Democratization and the Politics of Constitution-making in Turkey* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2009), 3.

follow. Despite 15 amendments and nine "harmonization packages" achieving standards in compliance with Copenhagen political criteria, the constitution still does not reflect a functional compromise, although it may be closer to compatible with EU requirements. Özbudun goes on to describe government as a function of checks and balances, which he differentiates from democracy.[37] In making a distinction between democratic government and constitutional consensus, he effectively implies the presence of illiberal democracy in Turkish government, but not the traditional order of events resulting in democracy, which typically requires liberty first. Ultimately, he concludes that the most recent iteration of Turkey's constitution, installed by coup in 1982, includes too many authoritarian threads to be healed by amendment. Such state power was deemed essential following the lawlessness of the 1970s. Özbudun calls for change that would allow the protection of citizens from the state, and not the other way around.[38]

It is feasible that the roots of the authoritarianism extend back to before the current Turkish state even existed. How did Turkey fare with such authoritarianism throughout its imperial history? The Sultans of the Ottoman Empire ruled large portions of Arabia, North Africa, and the Near East until well into the 19th century, and Turkey until World War I. Although actual control of these regions varied from locale to locale and power was not centralized, what power was exercised was certainly authoritarian in nature.[39] Under Sultan Mahmut II in the 1820s, power was more centralized via the building of a new national army and the destruction of the Janissary corps. Administrative power was likewise consolidated, and this was simpler than in prior years due to territorial losses.[40] At that juncture, one might consider the Ottoman Empire to have acquired the workings of a modern state in which authoritarian monarchy ruled.

The form of this rule began to alter in keeping with modernization during the reform era known as the *Tanzimat,* in the middle 19th century. During this period,

---

[37] Ibid.

[38] Ergun Özbudun, "The Turkish Constitutional Court and Political Crisis," in *Democracy, Islam, and Secularism in Turkey*, ed. Ahmet Kuru and Alfred Stepan (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), 149–51.

[39] Erik Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, 3rd ed. (London: I.B. Tauris, 2004), 1–21.

[40] Ibid., 30–42.

European-influenced statesmen took control of the state and instituted westernizing reforms, even as the Sultan ruled in name. The real power in the government became a function of bureaucracy, and internal affairs were increasingly controlled by the foreign ministry as European influence in Turkey grew. Secularization of education in Turkey began in earnest during this period, and Islamic dominance of law was limited to family matters. As the majority did not support this decision, these moves were also authoritarian. The reformers viewed themselves as liberals and envisioned a liberal state in the making. These ambitions were derailed for a time due to the Crisis of the 1870s, as Turkey fell under the influence of more authoritarian states in Europe. Up until this point, France was a primary influence, but following the Crimean War it entered decline and Turkey came under the influence of Prussia. The crisis led to the deposition of the Sultan and the Ottoman Empire's first constitutional era, but no real lapse in authoritarian government.[41]

The constitutional revolution of 1908 ushered in a period of political turmoil that lasted until the post-World War I independence struggle was won. The Unionist movement that began the revolution was countered by conservative and liberal elements, so subsequent rebellion by outlying states of the Empire resulted in the Balkan Wars. When the Unionists emerged victorious, they pushed a shift from liberalism to nationalism. Finally, the alliance structure of Europe resulted in friendship with Germany due to ongoing conflict with Russia. After the central powers lost the war, the victors divided erstwhile Ottoman territory into pieces as had always been done in European affairs. Moreover, they occupied the Bosporus and became dominant in Turkish affairs. The independence war of the 1920s left Mustafa Kemal (Ataturk) and his party in control of Turkey. Ataturk's status as father of the nation was integral to the emergence of the one party system, and this system's creation of the new Turkish identity was only possible through authoritarian (indeed totalitarian) means. The Turkish republic was founded in 1923, and thereafter all within were considered Turks, if only by the state.[42]

---

[41] Ibid., 50–73.

[42] Ibid., 93–206.

The subjugation of previous myriad identities was a long and ultimately unsuccessful effort on the part of those who became known as Kemalists.

As Dankwar Rustow illustrates, the Kemalist revolution was the summation of modernization efforts begun under the Ottoman Sultans. These efforts were bent upon Europeanization for the purposes of international competition, but the creation of a homogenous state where an empire had stood was also intended. In reality, the resulting state was not homogenous, but was ruled and guided by a single ideology and nation. Kemalism did claim to support popular sovereignty, civic-mindedness, and mass participation in politics, but the movement was actually a small, city-based upper class. Kemal himself and many of his reforms (perhaps most notably in education) were elitist, and his governmental restructuring was top-down, with the government imposing those measures it deemed would allow it to modernize and compete on the international stage.[43] The society that resulted was accordingly elitist and the values held by the elite in question ended up enshrined in law. Individual liberties were compromised and some indigenous cultures remain marginalized to this day. The enduring legacy of Ataturk appears to have survived as modernization and secularism, but authoritarianism was the method he used to create Turkey and Kemalism.

The one-party system that arose from the ashes of the Ottoman Empire lasted until 1945. Thereafter, the military assumed guardianship of the state and Kemalist ideology, engaging in multiple coups. According to William Hale, the regimes that resulted were (as all military regimes are) authoritarian as they acted to constrain civil liberties in the supposed pursuit of state interests. However, the expectation of limited periods of power also constrained the regimes and their scope of control.[44] Hale also applies Morris Janowitz's "totalitarian-penetration model" to the rise of Ataturk when attempting to categorize Turkey's government during that era. The model is meant to refer to a non-praetorian regime in which the military is subservient to civilian power and does not act autonomously. The source of such a regime's power is still the military; only

---

[43] Dankwart Rustow, "The Modernization of Turkey in Historical and Comparative Perspective," in *Social Change and Politics in Turkey: A Structural-Historical Analysis*, ed. Kemal Karpat (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1973), 118–120.

[44] William Hale, *Turkish Politics and the Military* (Oxon, England: Routledge, 1994), 310–316.

the leadership of said military maintains party ideology and conforms to party norms.[45] Ataturk's government might also fit into the mold of the "ruler regime" as also described by Hale, in that it arose out of the military, exercised control for a long time, and made permanent systemic changes.[46] Both types of regime are authoritarian in nature.

It has been argued that Turkey's version of laïcité (secularism of the state) is entwined with its version of authoritarianism. Since Ataturk forcibly installed secularism as a state precept, the state has had to resort to authoritarian measures to keep it in place. As Ahmet Kuru and Alfred Stepan point out, the Turkish Constitutional Court essentially found in favor of Western paranoia when it determined that "assertive secularism" was necessary to maintain laïcité in a Muslim-majority state due to Islam's unique qualities. The work in question also found that Christianity had like characteristics making a similar policy necessary to maintain laïcité in France, but still determined that French methods were more liberal than Turkish ones. Turkish forcefulness on this front has resulted in "state-society tension" according to Kuru and Stepan. This is due to the manufacture of restrictions on public religious practice. Conversely, their work also found that an "assertive" interpretation of Islam would not be compatible with laïcité in any form.[47] The combination of findings implies that authoritarian behavior is currently unavoidable in Turkey, as both secularism and Islam have strong bases there.

Despite strong bases of support for both ideologies, the Turkish republic began as a secular state. It has not yet shed the vestiges of its beginnings, and the remnants of origin are strong enough for Ergun Özbudun to refer to it as a "monolithic state structure."[48] In making this reference, he is attempting to indicate the degree to which the founding principles of Turkey fail to contribute to the development of a pluralist political

---

[45] Morris Janowitz, *Military Institutions and Coercion in the Developing Nations* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977), 79–80.

[46] Hale, *Turkish Politics and the Military*, 308–310.

[47] Ahmet Kuru and Alfred Stepan, "Laicite as an 'Ideal Type' and a Continuum: Comparing Turkey, France, and Senegal," in *Democracy, Islam, and Secularism in Turkey* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), 114–116.

[48] Ergun Özbudun, "Turkey-Plural Society and Monolithic State," in *Democracy, Islam, and Secularism in* Turkey, ed. Ahmet Kuru and Alfred Stepan (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), 61.

arena or infrastructure.[49] The Kemalist principles most responsible for this are secularism, nationalism, and elitism. Given the way these planks preclude the political interests of multiple communities living in Turkey, it would be difficult to refer to Turkish democracy as the result of consensus. The exclusion of Kurdish, Armenian, Alevi, and Islamic interests from official state function has been a point of contention, and only the latter exclusion is being eroded by the current government. Much of the political landscape has been divided up by geographical region.[50]

The only party that enjoys support from all areas of Turkey is the *Adalet ve Kalkinma Partisi* (AKP), otherwise known as the Justice and Development Party. The AKP is a center-right, conservative party with Islamist roots that was founded in 2001, but developed out of a larger Islamist movement originating in the last decade of the twentieth century. Although the party has portrayed itself as pro-West at various points, it has shifted positions as necessary to maintain popularity. Economic reforms are its primary claim to success. The AKP is a party with platforms directly opposed to the founding structure of the republic.[51] As a result of this foundation, and due to the failure of recent attempts at constitutional revision, a divided political scenario is portrayed that would require systemic modification to remedy. The state's existing institutions are not designed to allow this. Although Turkish society is comprised of many different communities and has a 50-year history of political party pluralism, this has not yet been enough to overcome the state structure.[52]

The most potent purveyor of this structure is Turkey's 1982 Constitution. The result of a coup, it provided the Turkish military undue influence and autonomy. The result was an enlarging of the guardianship role that the military played from the inception of Turkish multi-party politics in 1945. The aforementioned influence has often been equated with authoritarianism by the AKP, as it has sought to amend the

---

[49] Ibid.

[50] Ibid., 70–75.

[51] Arda Can Kumbaracibasi, *Turkish Politics and the Rise of the AKP: Dilemmas of Institutionalization and Leadership Strategy* (Oxon, England: Routledge, 2009), 1–5.

[52] Ibid., 87–77.

constitution.[53] Even so, the military's ability to affect domestic policy has been more a function of its status in Turkish society than any written documents. Gareth Jenkins demonstrates that the Turkish military has been very successful in terminating what it views as dangerous policies.[54] Just before the new millennium, the military began to increase its role in national politics in response to the perceived threats of Islamism and Kurdish nationalism. The former's increasing electoral support culminated in Ankara mayor Bekir Yildiz banning the sale of alcohol and tobacco in his city and making a speech in support of *sharia* law. The military sent a column of tanks through an Ankara suburb, issued warnings, and Yildiz was arrested. This was followed by the National Security Council (NSC) forcing then-president Erbakan to sign a package of 18 anti-Islamist laws, and military support for measures to close the Islamist Welfare Party (WP) for subversive action.[55] The military began a similar campaign against Kurdish nationalism and the Kurdistan Worker's Party (PKK), but in response to an armed offensive.[56] The dichotomy makes it difficult to classify the military's actions towards the PKK as authoritarian, except to point out that repression of Kurdish desire to make public use of the Kurdish language *supported* Kemalist nationalism, assimilation, and authoritarianism. Admittedly, the catalysts for these scenarios make it difficult to label military action any more authoritarian than that of Yildiz or Ocalan, but the ability of the military to unduly influence Turkish politics is well outlined by both situations.

A decade into the new millennium, an attitude of winner-take-all seems to prevail in Turkish politics. Buran Gilgehan Özpek points out that immediately prior to and following the 2011 elections, those parties that achieved representation avowed constitutional modification in accordance with their precepts. These promises were taken seriously because upon commencing legislation, the parties involved agreed to negotiate without any preset requirements. The primary issues to be addressed included human

---

[53] Gulsen Solaker, "Hopes Fade for a New Turkish Constitution," Reuters, November 18, 2013, http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/11/18/us-turkey-constitution-idUSBRE9AH0OV20131118.

[54] Gareth Jenkins, *Context and Circumstance: The Turkish Military and Politics*, Adelphi Paper (Oxon, England: Routledge, 2001), 57.

[55] Ibid., 59–64.

[56] Ibid., 67.

rights, term limits, judicial autonomy, and the 'Kurdish question.'[57] At the time, Özpek expressed little confidence that consensus would be reached based upon the Turkish history of "prioritizing political survival over democracy."[58] His doubts appear to have been confirmed by the recent breakdown in the constitutional talks that lasted two years. The breakdown appears to be centered around the definition of citizenship and the assurance of religious freedoms, and makes the results of the 2014 elections all the more important given the AKP's push for increased executive powers.[59]

The 2014 elections in Turkey have triggered a mass of journalistic queries regarding the changing nature of the state's government. Authoritarianism has become a buzzword for the direction that Prime Minister Erdogan's regime is heading whether democratically or not. On March 27, Cemal Burak Tansel opined that "reports of Turkey's authoritarianism are not greatly exaggerated."[60] In his view, the AKP's electoral victories have led to one-party dominance that serves whatever agenda the AKP has to put forth. The party justifies its policies via these victories, and the AKP's comprehension of politics and government appears to be that winning elections conveys the authority to engage in any action. Erdogan continuously cites the aforementioned elections whenever his policies or actions are criticized. These critics are alternately dubbed remnants of the Kemalist upper class or subversive followers of Fethullah Gulen. Regardless of their identity it is clear that since the Gezi Park protests, a large portion of the populace does not believe the AKP's rule to be legitimate, and the AKP does not believe its opponents to be so.[61]

This lack of consensus demonstrates a widening rift in Turkey that appears to result from the rogue actions of the current regime, but the veneer displayed by Erdogan

---

[57] Buran Bilgehan Özpek, "Constitution-Making in Turkey after the 2011 Elections," *Turkish Studies* 13, no. 3 (2012): 153–165.

[58] Ibid.

[59] Gulsen Solaker, "Hopes Fade for a New Turkish Constitution," Reuters, last accessed March 2014, http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/11/18/us-turkey-constitution-idUSBRE9AH0OV20131118.

[60] "Reports of Turkey's Authoritarianism Are Not Greatly Exaggerated," opendemocracy, accessed April 27, 2014, http://www.opendemocracy.net/arab-awakening/cemal-burak-tansel/reports-of-turkey%E2%80%99s-authoritarianism-are-not-greatly-exaggerated.

[61] Ibid.

in the face of opposition is not so unusual in Turkish politics. As Mustafa Akyol points out, leaders are often expected to display a stubbornly combative demeanor in political arguments. This is viewed as the only route to victory, and pre-emptive actions to prevent resistance are considered legitimate political behavior. The conservatives who support Erdogan expect this attitude, and would feel betrayed by Erdogan if he allowed political concessions. Such a course is thought to be the first step towards loss of power or legitimacy. Thus, the political conservatives of Turkey (not to be confused with Kemalists) are more and more supportive of Erdogan even as his behavior appears more irrational and incompatible with democracy or human rights. However, this "iron will," as it is popularized in Turkish campaign politics, is not a new function of Turkish leadership. Indeed, Ataturk's rule was based upon similar traits, but served secular purposes rather than Islamist ones.[62] This difference may account for why both the West and the Turkish Left see Erdogan's behavior as so threatening to liberal ideology and practice.

Protests indicate that many inhabitants of Turkey are dismayed by Erdogan's recent actions. Scholars find that the enshrined system results from lack of consensus, and history shows that the roots of a rigid state structure are mired in the Ottoman Empire's attempts to modernize after imperialism. The planks of the movement that resulted from this modernization do not lend themselves to the maintenance of political pluralism or establishment of civil liberties. Secularism was joined to authoritarianism in Turkey, and guarded by the military. Now, the winner-take-all political arena of the state has lent its favor to a party of religion, and it too appears to display authoritarian behavior. The roots of that behavior run throughout the entirety of Turkish society, and it appears that such behavior is even expected from Turkish politicians when they are faced with criticism. If authoritarianism is entrenched in Turkey's governmental system, a change like the constitutional revision recently attempted would be required to eliminate it. If authoritarianism is entrenched in the Turkish psyche, it may not be removable.

---

[62] "Turkey's Doctrine of Pre-Emptive Authoritarianism," *Al-Monitor*, accessed April 27, 2014, http://www.al-monitor.com/pulseen/originals/2014/04/authoritarian-turkey-preemptive-erdogan.html.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

III.   THE JUSTICE AND DEVELOPMENT PARTY

The AKP rose to power in 2002 and has controlled Turkey's state government ever since. Neither corruption scandals nor mass protests have made a dent in its electoral dominance, which began with the AKP carrying 34.2 percent of the vote in the 2002 national elections (the nearest challenger was the CHP with 19.4 percent).[63] As of yet, there have not been any repercussions for the party's attempts to alter governmental structure in Turkey, as with attempts at constitutional and judicial reform.[64] How did this occur? How did one of several center-right Islamist parties manage to obtain support from the majority of the populace and form a successful government in such a difficult political landscape? Further, how did it accomplish this in a country with a system that has been ever-hostile towards religious parties? The answer has much to do with the larger movement and the sort of political methods that the AKP used. These were partly a function of Islamist ideology and partly a function of Turkey's demographics. This will be addressed in this chapter, along with a synopsis of the AKP's development, support, and actions to subdue the military. Finally, criticisms of the AKP will be addressed, along with its attempts to institutionalize itself. The balance it must maintain to hold power will be treated in the context of Turkish government.

It would be most logical to consider the AKP the culmination of a political movement rather than a stand-alone political party. Its prior iterations included the Welfare Party (RP) and the Virtue Party (FP). Both were dissolved due to suspected Islamist agendas and Kemalist/secularist fears of religion in politics. In this context, Islamism is a creed espousing an actual "reordering of government and society in accordance with laws prescribed by Islam."[65] Dicle Kogacioglu examined two cases that

---

[63] Arda Can Kumbaracibasi, *Turkish Politics and the Rise of the AKP: Dilemmas of Institutionalization and Leadership Strategy* (Oxon, England: Routledge, 2009), 97.

[64] "Turkey's President Signs Law Giving Government More Power over Judiciary," *Euronews*, February 27, 2014, http://www.euronews.com/2014/02/27/turkey-s-president-signs-law-giving-government-more-power-over-judiciary/; Gulsen Solaker, "Hopes Fade for a New Turkish Constitution," Reuters, November 18, 2013, http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/11/18/us-turkey-constitution-idUSBRE9AH0OV20131118.

[65] *Merriam-Webster*, s.v. "Islamism," accessed May 12, 2014 http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/islamism.

led to the elimination of political parties in Turkey to discern the function of the Turkish constitutional court in applying constitutional law to them. The first was a leftist Kurdish party (the People's Labor Party). The second party, which concerns this study, was a center-right Islamist party (the Welfare Party). Kogacioglu's contention is that these two cases shaped Turkey's political development in such a way as to alter the relationship between law and politics. In analyzing these, she argued that the constitution was interpreted by the constitutional court in accordance with Kemalist political agendas. [66] Her conclusion was "that the current legal provisions applicable to political parties do not provide political actors with an adequate level of protection in their exercise of freedom of association and freedom of expression."[67] As a result, the national legislature has constantly tried to lessen judicial power, and although they were unsuccessful, Erdogan has now succeeded in doing this. The battle that raged between Kemalism and Islamist movements occurred on this constitutional stage saw the AKP come to power.

The AKP's landslide electoral victory of 2002 was not unexpected, but still resulted in dramatic political change.[68] It resulted in the rule of the first single-party government to come to power since 1991, and the AKP became the first right-of-center Islamist party to take power and hold it. In essence, Kemalism was politically defeated during this election. No coup was forthcoming to protect Turkish secularism and 10 years later, via infiltration and the Ergenekon trials, military members were accused, tried, and jailed to prevent such a possibility.[69] At the time, scholars attributed the rise of the AKP to a mixture of pragmatism and ideology that appealed to a wide swath of voters. They also submitted that success had come for Erdogan and not for Necmettin Erbakan (Prime Minister from 1996–97) due to willingness to moderate ideology as necessary. Once in office, economic and foreign policy successes garnered further support, and by 2006

---

[66] Dicle Kogacioglu, "Dissolution of Political Parties by the Constitutional Court in Turkey: Judicial Delimitation of the Political Doman," *International Sociology* 18, no. 1 (2003), http://iss.sagepub.com/content/18/1/258.full.pdf.

[67] Ibid., 833.

[68] Ali Çarkoglu and Ersin Kalaycioglu, *Turkish Democracy Today: Elections, Protest and Stability in an Islamic Society* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2007), 1–3.

[69] Ibid., 214–215.

(despite some Islamist rhetoric) the AKP appeared to have garnered the public support required to consolidate power and maintain it for an extended period.[70]

In large part, the AKP's lengthy period of electoral success stems from its ability to navigate a complicated voting scene and tailor at least the appearance of its ideology to garner support from diverging demographics. Turkish constituency's level of complication is such that a simple left-right scale of values would not suffice to express the political situation. However, it can be generalized that the "center-right" section of the market is crowded by many parties championing conservative platforms. The AKP's origins as an Islamist party put it squarely in the middle of this segment, but it had to do more and attract a variety of support in order to win.[71] This was accomplished via an election manifesto that was very different from that of its preceding iterations or its competitors on the Islamist scene. It was both inclusive of non-Islamist segments and reinforcing of stalwart conservatives. Emphasis was placed on universal values, individual rights, human rights, women's empowerment, economic liberalism, privatization, tax reform, AND social welfare! All of this was touted in tandem with conservatism and successfully blended into a single platform. Although such a broad platform would have been laughed at in the West as unworkable, disparate constituents came together for the AKP due to a seemingly universal ideology that supported every faction in some manner.[72] This broad approach could not last, and the AKP has been forced to become less liberal in its approach since initial elections. Economic success and increasing support for conservative nationalists have allowed it to hold on to power while increasing its hold over the Turkish bureaucracy.[73]

The AKP's successes were not unqualified, and Joost Langendijk divides its reign into three periods during which it has enjoyed different levels of support. As a benchmark, he uses the AKP's domestic human rights reforms, which allowed it to meet

---

[70] Ibid., 219–221.

[71] Arda Can Kumbaracibasi, *Turkish Politics and the Rise of the AKP: Dilemmas of Institutionalization and Leadership Strategy* (Oxon, England: Routledge, 2009), 155.

[72] Ibid., 164–167.

[73] Ibid., 178–185.

the standards necessary to begin accession discussions with the European Union (EU). Langendijk maintains that during the first two years of its reign, the AKP accelerated and completed several of the liberalizing reforms begun under the prior government of Prime Minister Ecevit. This was done with the assistance of the opposition party (CHP), and resulted in the beginning of the accession process in 2005.[74] These moves were very popular in liberal circles, and allowed the AKP to create a temporary coalition between itself and the opposition. The measures also created an image of the AKP as something other than just an Islamist party (both at home and abroad). Such an image served as a tool for facilitating policy decisions and legislation, and allowed the AKP to further its electoral success.[75] Thereafter, the AKP experienced a period of lesser support as accession became a secondary issue for a number of reasons. New (less accepting) leadership in Europe combined with an inability to complete a constitutional revision and shifted attention to domestic issues for all parties. Conservative forces in Turkey used these changes to alter opinion in favor of isolationism, and the continuing impasse of Cyprus served to widen a rift between Turkey and the EU. This stand-off period continued until 2009, when the AKP finally stopped stalling on the issue of accession and returned attention to it, along with increasing the number of personnel allocated to the process. Cyprus remains a roadblock to the completion of the process, and Langendijk's opinion is that the issue's effect on Turkish public sentiment will determine the AKP's future actions regarding accession.[76] Thus, the AKP enters a period of uncertain support. While its electoral base remains strong enough for it to have won the 2014 elections (even increasing to a 45.6 percent count), support from opposition groups is needed to

---

[74] Joost Lagendijk, "Turkey's Accession to the European Union and the Role of the Justice and Development Party," in *Democracy, Islam, and Secularism in Turkey*, by Ahmet Kuru and Alfred Stepan (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), 185.

[75] Ibid., 171–172.

[76] Ibid., 185–186.

pass certain measures.[77] Due to aforementioned scandals and political measures, the AKP does not currently enjoy that support. For now, it is a waiting game for Turkish politics and accession to the European Union.

Jenny White refers to the manner of the AKP's birth as "vernacular politics." This term refers to the methods the AKP used to piece support together from citizens with opposing views and varied interests. White lived in a suburb of Istanbul during the formative years of the development of the AKP's preceding parties,[78] and applies the aforementioned term to the grass roots mobilization that the party carried out via cultural, rather than political devices.[79] White suggests the use of vernacular politics to bind political ideology to culture, and to fuse organization and process in the political sphere.[80] Her treatment of the Islamist movement in Turkey ends up likening it to a clandestine organization with regard to how cells of unrelated civic groups are linked. In this system, no cell really understands or interoperates with another. A particularly notable characteristic of the movement is its ability to survive the destruction of multiple political parties within the fold, and continue to form parties and attract support. The implication is that the methods of the movement are much more important to its constituents than any structure or even its agenda. Electoral victories indicate extremely effective organization and a broad array of constituents making up the many cells of the movement. White concludes that the glues holding the diverse factions together were and are shared local culture and personal interaction, as the agendas of the factions could not have been more diverse. Her point is that these interests coexisted in a single movement due to shared local cultures of the members and the institutionalization of a new politics

---

[77] Humeyra Pamuk and Nick Tattersall, "Erdogan Targets Enemies after Poll Triumph," Reuters, March 31, 2014, http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/03/31/us-turkey-election-idUSBREA2R12X20140331.

[78] Jenny White, *Islamist Mobilization in Turkey: A Study in Vernacular Politics* (Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 2002), x–xi.

[79] Ibid., 6–7.

[80] Ibid., 5–6.

in the country.[81] In a sense, this new politics is tantamount to power sharing between factions, but on a local level. The system has not yet been institutionalized in Turkish law or charter.

Kumbaracibasi argues that to maintain the power it has won, the AKP must institutionalize its party politics into the government of Turkey. He asserts that in order to do so, the AKP must balance entrenching its system against the maintenance of party autonomy. The extent to which it can do the former is constrained by the constitution as applied by law and the judiciary. This is particularly the case with regard to Turkey's constitutional court, hence the AKP's recent attempts to engage in constitutional rewrite and gain further control over the judiciary.[82] Constraints are also present in the form of the Law on Political Parties, which provides detailed rules curtailing concentration of party power. However, the law also forces a top-down hierarchy that does not necessarily allow for enduring support bases. Moreover, it prevents intra-party moves that might have allowed the AKP to institutionalize itself more while in power. The law also prevents deliberate inter-party power-sharing. Having been blocked on these fronts, Kumbaracibasi argues that the AKP has instead elected to "optimize" its institutionalization rather than "maximizing" it.[83] In so doing, it must control as many facets of government as possible, please traditional support bases, and jettison any that block such measures. In his opinion, the result is that the AKP is vulnerable to breakaway factions.[84] It is ironic that just such factionalism allowed for the birth of the party.[85]

---

[81] Ibid., 6–11, 21.

[82] Arda Can Kumbaracibasi, *Turkish Politics and the Rise of the AKP: Dilemmas of Institutionalization and Leadership Strategy* (Oxon, England: Routledge, 2009), 1–10; Gulsen Solaker, "Hopes Fade for a New Turkish Constitution," Reuters, November 18, 2013, http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/11/18/us-turkey-constitution-idUSBRE9AH0OV20131118; "Turkey's President Signs Law Giving Government More Power over Judiciary," *Euronews*, accessed March 6, 2014, http://www.euronews.com/2014/02/27/turkey-s-president-signs-law-giving-government-more-power-over-judiciary/.

[83] Kumbaracibasi, *Turkish Politics and the Rise of the AKP*, 3.

[84] Ibid., 189–192.

[85] Birol Yesilada, "The Virtue Party," in *Political Parties in Turkey*, ed. Barry Rubin and Metìn Heper (London: Frank Cass and Company Limited, 2002), 78–79.

Experts on Turkish affairs, like William Hale and Ergun Özbudun, maintain that the harshest criticisms of the AKP are illegitimate. Any assertions that the AKP is attempting to obtain control over all state institutions are rejected by these scholars as "patently false" (at least as of 2009), along with charges of corruption and any intentions to challenge democratic rule.[86] Charges of ebbing liberal zeal giving way to conservative constituents are found to be substantiated, although the majority of party actions in this regard appear to involve the Kurdish question or that of headscarves.[87] The sharing of power with other parties is mentioned, but seems to refer only to individual incidents like cooperation with the Nationalist Action Party (MHP) to elect Abdulluh Gül as president. The aforementioned headscarf issue also involved cooperation with the MHP and even with the Kurdish nationalist party (DTP). However, none of these moves institutionalized the AKP, resulted in permanent alliance, or involved power sharing. Constitutional issues pursued by the AKP are addressed by Hale and Özbudun as a function of individual social goals, but the import they might have for systemic change is not covered. Instead, the judiciary's ability to strike down certain moves appears to be taken as proof that the AKP is operating within the existing system.[88]

Still other scholars maintain that a form of institutionalization is taking place on another level. M. Hakan Yavuz asserts that the rise of the AKP has led to the end of what he calls "dual sovereignty."[89] He is referring to the termination of military capability to check the state's political course. Additionally, Yavuz claims that the developing democratic process integrated the interests of urban and rural populations, as well as those of conservatives and the state. These changes can only be called temporary, in that they were not codified. He also points out that the cost is a growing rift between the state

---

[86] William *The Case of the AKP* (Oxon, England: Routledge, 2010), 150–151.

[87] The AKP eliminated a ban on the headscarf in public space, which had been installed by Kemal Ataturk. This issue had polarized Turkish society between staunch Islam and secularism for 75 years. Hale and Özbudun, *Islamism, Democracy and Liberalism in Turkey*, 155–157; Sebnem Arsu and Dan Bilefsky, "Turkey Lifts Longtime Ban on Head Scarves in State Offices," *The New York Times*, October 8, 2013, sec. World / Europe, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/10/09/world/europe/turkey-lifts-ban-on-head-scarves-in-state-offices.html.

[88] Ibid., 154–158.

[89] Hakan Yavuz, *Secularism and Muslim Democracy in Turkey* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 267.

and secular interests. Moreover, the impasse between the state and Kurdish interests is growing. Perhaps his most relevant contribution in this area is the concept of the rise of "entrepreneurial politics."[90] This refers to the AKP's push for economics as a model for politics, and the use of a growing economy to serve popular needs rather than state needs (which Yavuz asserts had been the function of government prior).[91]The new political-economic model has not yet been institutionalized or codified in Turkish government or law. It might be said that the AKP has institutionalized its type of politics, but not in such a way as to allow a lasting monopoly of the system.

Some actually maintain that what the AKP faces is institutionalization of power sharing from its opposition. Ümrit Cizre suggests that the Turkish military is still a threat to civilian-led politics, and asserts that it is institutionalizing relationships between itself, the judiciary, and the foreign ministry. The ostensible purpose is "to establish the hegemony of its own understandings of secularism, security, and democracy." In doing so, the military has now altered course to target societal rather than state change. For the most part, the power-sharing relationships the military might utilize to do this are pre-existing. The General Staff and Foreign Ministry traditionally coordinate to determine Turkish foreign policy.[92] The actual codification of any further integration is not verifiable or legal, if in fact armed forces are engaged in any such efforts since the results of the Sledgehammer trials.[93]

The failure of the AKP to institutionalize itself via constitutional revision means that it must either re-attempt such or find another way to institutionalize. After 12 years of rule, and a series of scandals, the AKP has found it necessary to eject some members caught up in the public eye. Its brightest star, Prime Minister Erdogan, eyes a presidential

---

[90] Ibid.

[91] Ibid., 267–279.

[92] Ümit Cizre, "A New Politics of Engagement: The Turkish Military, Society, and the AKP," in *Democracy, Islam, and Secularism in Turkey*, ed. Ahmet Kuru and Alfred Stepan (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), 122–24.

[93] The sledgehammer trials involved a number of Turkish officers who had debated overthrowing the AKP. A decade later infiltration allowed the prosecution of officers deemed instrumental in the plot, which was never executed. Simon Tisdall, "Turkey's Sledgehammer Coup Verdict: Justice or Soviet-Style Show Trial?" *The Guardian*, September 25, 2012, sec. Comment is free, http://www.theguardian.com/world/2012/sep/25/turkey-sledgehammer-coup-trial-verdict

run pending the end of his current term in the ministry and the outcome of a supposed feud with exiled cleric Fethullah Gulen. All of this causes opponents of Erdogan and the AKP to fear the concentration of "too much power in the hands of a man who they say has shown increasingly authoritarian tendencies." [94] Most of this sentiment has been in response to AKP interference in law enforcement and Erdogan's banning of social media.[95] While a portion of the latter decree was overturned, it appears that the former legislation will stand. A rift has opened between Erdogan and President Gül regarding this and other issues, and it appears that the latter will depart government following his current term as president. If Erdogan becomes president and acquires a loyal AKP member as his Prime Minister, the potential for authoritarian domination by national government in Turkey will increase.[96]

---

[94] "Politics—Turkish PM Hints at Presidential Run, as Ruling AKP Maintains Decisions," *Hurriyet Daily News*, May 2, 2014, http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/turkish-pm--hints-at-presidential-run-as-ruling-akp-maintains-decisions.aspx?pageID=238&nID=65931&NewsCatID=338.

[95] Prime Minister Erdogan banned both Youtube and Twitter for a time in response to the posting of data regarding his corruption scandal. Later, the Youtube ban was overturned by the judiciary. Eliana Dockterman, "Turkey Bans Twitter," *TIME*, March 20, 2014, http://time.com/32864/turkey-bans-twitter/

[96] Ibid.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

IV. AUTHORITARIAN TYPOLOGIES IN MODERN TURKEY

Why have the AKP and its brand of government arisen in Turkey out of nominal democracy? Kemalism has been the governing ideology of Turkey since its inception as a republic in 1923. It might be classified as a totalitarian or fascist ideology given the nature of Atatürk's popularity, its forced secularism measures, the preeminence of the state in its philosophy, and its extreme nationalist rhetoric.[97] However, Juan Linz contends that a strand of authoritarianism actually develops in response to the unrealistic utopian promises of such fascism, and that this authoritarianism itself must then progress towards another type of government.[98] This type of authoritarianism is dubbed "post-democratic mobilizational" by Linz,[99] and it is the assertion of this chapter that the regime of the AKP falls into this category. In order to demonstrate this, it is necessary to establish that Turkey's current regime is authoritarian and of the type in question. First, Linz's characterization of authoritarianism in general will be covered. Second, the strand that likely comprised Kemalism will be described. Third, the typology of post-democratic mobilizational authoritarianism will be detailed. Last, the acts and developments of the AKP that allow its characterization will be cited and categorized. As the current path of Turkey does not take it further into the realm of democracy, it may be that this typology can be established before the current regime necessarily morphs into the sort of government Linz says must follow.[100]

A. CHARACTERIZING AUTHORITARIANISM

It is difficult to narrowly characterize authoritarianism because traditionally the term is used as a catch-all for regimes that do not fit into the categories of democracy or totalitarianism, but rather somewhere in between.[101] Available authoritarian models for

---

[97] Erik Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, 3rd ed. (London: I.B. Tauris, 2004), 186.

[98] Juan Linz, *Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 2000), 219–224.

[99] Ibid., 176–177.

[100] Ibid., 166.

[101] Ibid., 159.

analysis of Turkey's current regime (as addressed in Chapter 1) include those of Duckitt, Perlmutter, Stellmacher and Petzel, Levitsky and Way, Solt, Diamond, and Linz. Although Duckitt's model set the stage for modern authoritarian theory, it cannot feasibly be used for our purposes as it discounts the import of individual behavior.[102] It is arguable that the majority of the AKP's authoritarian tendencies have been demonstrated by Minister Erdogan. Perlmutter's categorization of authoritarian states might serve for Turkey, as he recognizes both praetorian and party varieties. However, he also argues that ideology is a requirement for institutionalization of authoritarianism into political frameworks, and much of what the AKP has managed to embed in Turkish government was accomplished via something other than ideological means.[103] While Stellmacher and Petzel offer a broad model of authoritarianism, it cannot easily be applied to contemporary Turkey as it claims that authoritarian behaviors are activated as defense mechanisms by threatened groups.[104] The AKP's center-right base did not come under any new threat early in the new millennium. The model offered by Levitsky and Way addresses the transitions between types of government (not types of authoritarianism) and offers gauges by which to measure a state's level of authoritarianism. It does not offer a viable model to match to a particular authoritarian state as different from others.[105] Solt claims that economic inequality leads to authoritarian government by the wealthy,[106] but does not address what happens when inequality lessens, as it has in Turkey under a decade of government that this study terms authoritarian.[107] Diamond's theory of personal rule might adequately be used to characterize Erdogan, but would forcibly take Turkey's situation as a whole out of its context. Despite corruption charges, economic

---

[102] John Duckitt, "Authoritarianism and Group Identification: A New View of an Old Construct," *Political Psychology* 10, no. 1 (March 1989): 63, 81–82.

[103] Amos Perlmutter, *Modern Authoritarianism: A Comparative Institutional Analysis* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1981), 1–2, 28–51, 174–176.

[104] Jost Stellmacher and Thomas Petzel, "Authoritarianism as a Group Phenomenon," *Political Psychology: Authoritarianism*, 26, no. 2 (April 2005): 245–249, 261–263.

[105] Steven Levitsky and Lucan Way, "Elections without Democracy: The Rise of Competitive Authoritarianism," *Journal of Democracy* 13, no. 2 (2002): 52–54.

[106] Frederick Solt, "The Social Origins of Authoritarianism," *Political Research Quarterly* 65, no. 4 (2012): 703–705.

[107] "The Rise of Income Inequality amongst Rich Countries," Inequality Watch, accessed April 4, 2014, http://inequalitywatch.eu/spip.php?article58.

inequality has decreased in Turkey[108], and Diamond's theory relies upon crony-capitalism and the concept of private goods.[109] Of the available models, only Linz's theories offer specific social analyses of authoritarianism as a function of societal stages and specific characteristics that allow characterization of multiple types.

Linz's stated methods of categorization focus on how a regime exercises power, organizes its body, connects itself to the host society, and perpetuates a belief system to control the state. The results of these methods affect how citizens may function in that state. Linz specifically rules out addressing policy content, long-term goals, or stated purpose in defining a regime's type, and therefore does not address why certain groups are excluded from political action in an authoritarian state. He also specifically refers to authoritarian bodies as "regimes" rather than "governments" in order to indicate the reach of these entities. The term government implies an official and limited type of civic control, while authoritarianism specifically deviates from this and seeks to penetrate all of a society's layers with its institutional instruments.[110] Linz does identify seven definite characteristics that indicate authoritarian behavior on the part of a party or regime: limited pluralism, limited monism, single party privilege, party fusion, mentality, lack of procedural consensus, and broad penetration of institutions. These will be described in turn, along with a treatment of what traits allow differentiation between authoritarian regimes and others that might exhibit similar properties.

First, Linz specifically states that the most important function of an authoritarian regime is the employment or allowance of limited pluralism. This factor sets authoritarianism in direct contrast to democracy owing to what Linz calls the latter's "almost unlimited pluralism."[111] While the latter claim may or may not be supportable, limited pluralism does suggest an extremely large area of operation, as it is anything not completely monolithic or completely inclusive. As has been suggested, this range

---

[108] Ibid.

[109] Larry Diamond, "The Rule of Law Versus the Big Man," *Journal of Democracy* 19, no. 2 (2008): 138–149.

[110] Ibid., 160.

[111] Ibid., 161.

excludes democracy and totalitarianism, but not much else. The methods employed to achieve the limited pluralism in question are once again immaterial. Linz states that the employed controls might be merely legal, strictly a function of politics, or extended to interest groups and institutions. At root, however responsive the regime might be to the populace or its institutions, it is not accountable to them in an authoritarian system. For this reason, the power of such a regime does not derive from constituents, but rather from the means of its organization.[112]

Second, the described, limited pluralism is often accompanied by "limited monism."[113] In this context, the characteristic may be considered tantamount to an authoritarian *pensée unique*.[114] An authoritarian regime engaging in this pattern will see a single type of solution to varied problems and apply a single principle to explaining all. Obviously, this characteristic is a likely explanation for the behavior of religious zealots and fundamentalists, but in an authoritarian regime it will further limit pluralism and increase political exclusion. Any opposition is likely to be explained or condemned via repeated rhetoric, and the ebbing effect of such a mantra on constituent opinion will be unimportant in a system without accountability. Limited monism and limited pluralism function together to describe the range of regimes that might be termed authoritarian.[115]

Third, a "single or privileged party" is often the result or initiator of limited pluralism, and functions as the lone exerciser of actual political power in an authoritarian system.[116] Linz offers that often such a party will officially claim a monopoly of power in the same manner that a totalitarian party would, and indeed the two will perform the same political functions. However, the means used to maintain power are not shared between the two, as will be discussed later. Power is most often solidified via a pre-existing power base that can be converted into party format or force rather than via "grass roots" movements. Thus, a group already in power may use party politics to consolidate

---

[112] Ibid.

[113] Ibid.

[114] A societal mentality that results in a sort of myopia. John Richard Bowen, *Why the French Don't Like Headscarves: Islam, the State, and Public Space* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007), 3–5.

[115] Linz, *Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes*, 161.

[116] Ibid.

power and prevent challenges. As has been stated, Linz points out that such means do not necessarily address constituency or purpose, and that those who construct such a party often may do so by combining a number of groups rather than just resorting to exclusion.[117]

Fourth is the above-mentioned concept of party fusion, referred to in some African regimes as "*parti unifie* rather than *parti unique*." [118] This is not a function of monolithic power as in a totalitarian system, but rather a combination of existing elements with interests similar enough to allow a common political platform. Either this, or those who drive the fusion convince the individual elements of similar interest and the merger occurs under false pretenses.[119] It should be pointed out that this is the same method used to form a government after elections in a parliamentary system. Unless the elected party has an absolute majority, it must combine forces with other parties to achieve a majority and form a working government. Thus, an authoritarian system mirrors parliamentary government without maintaining strict observance of continuing pluralism, since after the merger the newly privileged party will prevent further challenges to its power and discount dissenting political positions.

Fifth is the "mentality" that authoritarians adopt, which distinguishes them from totalitarians who employ an "ideology."[120] For Linz, the difference is pivotal, and he likens mentality to limited monism in that it is a kind of unique thinking that excludes other views. In this context, mentality is at once emotional rather than rational, uncodified, subjective, and based in concerns of the present rather than the lessons of the past. Conversely, ideology is often utopian (for regimes), codified, objective, and employs "closed cognition."[121] Standing in contrast to both systems, democracy is based upon procedural consensus and often requires ideological commitment to function. Linz claims that mentality hamstrings authoritarian regimes in that it fails to inspire, is difficult

---

[117] Ibid., 162.

[118] Ibid.

[119] Ibid.

[120] Ibid.

[121] Ibid.

to disseminate, and is harder to discern loyalty to. However, mentality also avoids coming into conflict with over-riding beliefs like religion or science, and therefore allows the aforementioned fusing of interests. While he admits a sometimes hazy distinction between the two, Linz points out the difference in practice by referring to how a bureaucratic-military dictator is likely to disseminate personal mentality, while a totalitarian is more likely to achieve "programmatic consensus."[122]

Sixth is a lack of procedural consensus. Requiring little explanation, this refers to the same factors that limited pluralism does, and addresses the lack of democratic institutions. Dissenting voices are not heard, government is not accountable to citizenry via election or lobbying, checks on power are not institutionalized. While ideology often addresses desired procedure based upon principle, mentality rarely does this except to reiterate a single preferred method or goal. Both totalitarian and democratic systems may exhibit procedural consensus even if methods and goals are disputed. By Linz's definition, authoritarian systems will not achieve this consensus within their populations.[123]

Seventh and last among Linz's characteristics of authoritarian systems is the lack of institutional specificity they display. Such systems employ institutions that penetrate all aspects of life and serve as controls to prevent pluralism, expression of alternate ideology, and dissenting political participation. These controls will extend into religious and corporate realms, and are indicative of authoritarian state structures. To an extent, "low specificity of political institutions" is the glue that holds the other pieces of authoritarianism together, because it provides potential control over all aspects of life in a society.[124] It is also the factor that is most indicative of how the Turkish republic began its affair with authoritarianism, and its use continues to the present day.

---

[122] Ibid., 163.

[123] Ibid., 161–165.

[124] Ibid., 160.

B. POST-INDEPENDENCE MOBILIZATIONAL AUTHORITARIANISM

Although scholars cite Atatürk's dislike of dictatorship and Kemalism's lack of extensive mobilization as reasons to avoid classifying it as fascism, claims that Kemal himself was not used as a guiding political principal are belied by the very term "Kemalism," along with the many military coups enacted to prevent the sullying of Atatürk's legacy.[125] The typology of authoritarianism that best fits Turkey during the era of Mustafa Kemal is Linz's model of "post-independence mobilizational authoritarianism," which describes a regime forged during a national struggle for independence.[126] The characteristics of this typology will be elaborated upon, and post-Ottoman Turkey will be matched to them. This shall set the stage for the democracy that followed, and the authoritarianism that appears to have re-developed since.

At base, post-independence mobilizational authoritarianism arises when a single party engages in grass-roots mobilization of the population to create a new regime from the bottom-up in place of an imperial or colonial government. Fertile ground for such action is found in regions with low economic development and modern economic elites that are small, foreign, or have strong ties to foreign interests.[127] Like fascism, the situation described sees decolonization, independence, and statehood become identified with both the leader that facilitates them and the party associated with him or her. However, Linz maintains that there are significant structural weaknesses present in such an apparatus.[128] Addressing the situation created by the rise of such a regime, he states, "the artificial character of many of the state boundaries, the ethnic, linguistic, and religious diversity of the population, the great difference in social development of the few urban centers and coastal areas and the rural periphery, and the weakness of administrative institutions led the leaders of the new independent states to believe that their party could serve as a nation-building instrument. Faced with the problems of

---

[125] Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, 186; Jenny White, *Islamist Mobilization in Turkey: A Study in Vernacular Politics* (Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 2002), 252–60.

[126] Linz, *Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes*, 227.

[127] Ibid.

[128] Ibid., 228.

national integration, the not-always loyal opposition, and the fear of foreign influences, the dominant party, in the context of political culture that had not institutionalized liberal democratic values, soon became a single party."[129] The weaknesses in question necessarily led to single-party dominance and an attempt to unify the populace under a new manufactured identity that blends demographics with diverse ethnic backgrounds. The same can be seen in the formation of Turkey, given the broad group of populations that made up the Ottoman Empire preceding it.[130] Despite the manufacture of a new identity, the Kurds (for example) continue to engage in separatist action to this day.[131]

In such environs, a professional middle class is not encouraged. Instead, the state's operation becomes based upon formal structures devised "according to the normative expectations of the elites."[132] Party and leader became symbols of unity and success, while the principles they espouse may remain points of contention. In a sense, both the leader and the party become means to a "self-justifying goal" of impossible political interaction.[133] As described, the expectation is that somehow these entities can be responsive enough to popular sentiment to allow political participation without the problematic effects of party pluralism or actual democratic institutions. Linz is clear in stating that the unrealistic expectations of such interaction leads to temporary functionality, and that democracy or totalitarianism must develop out of such regimes.[134] How then do these characteristics fit with Kemal's Turkish Republic?

Most of this model's characteristics fit the description of Turkey's rise from the ashes of the Ottoman Empire. Historians of Ottoman and Turkish history have already documented those characteristics extensively. Turkey did develop out of an empire

---

[129] Ibid., 229.

[130] Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, 163–72.

[131] Attorney-General's Department, "Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK)," accessed May 9, 2014, http://www.nationalsecurity.gov.au/Listedterroristorganisations/Pages/KurdistanWorkersPartyPKK.aspx; "Kurdistan Worker's Party (PKK)," Terrorist Organization Profiles, accessed May 8, 2014, http://www.start.umd.edu/tops/terrorist_organization_profile.asp?id=63; "Chapter 6—Terrorist Organizations," in *Country Reports of Terrorism*, U.S. Department of State, Office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism, April 30, 2008, http://m.state.gov/md103714.htm.

[132] Linz, *Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes*, 231.

[133] Ibid.

[134] Ibid., 232.

possessing a court riddled with foreign influence,[135] and it had to struggle against the imperial powers of Europe to gain independence following post-World War II attempts to carve up former territories of the Ottoman Empire.[136] The resulting structure under Atatürk was a one-party state, and "normative expectations of the elites" clearly equate to Kemalist doctrine.[137] The lasting, tangible symbol of the republic has remained Atatürk even during a period of Islamist control. Long after Kemal's death, his party (the *Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi* or CHP) maintained control over the state with the help of the military, and it still serves as Turkey's primary opposition party.[138] The real move towards open electoral democracy in Turkey occurred between 1945 and 1950,[139] and the alphabet soup of political parties that followed seems to prove the existence of political pluralism until one considers the regular interference of the military.[140] The European Union certainly did, and required compliance with Copenhagen criteria on civil-military relations for accession talks to proceed.[141] However, military interference could also have been considered a check on authoritarian or totalitarian tendencies during various Turkish regimes. In any case, post-Atatürk political developments in Turkey fit Linz's model of authoritarianism being followed by democracy or totalitarianism. If one accepts that democracy has existed in Turkey, Linz maintains that this qualifies as fertile ground for still another type of authoritarianism to take root.

---

[135] Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, 9–76.

[136] Ibid., 133-166.

[137] Linz, *Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes*, 231; M. Sukru Hanioglu, "The Historical Roots of Kemalism" in *Democracy, Islam, and Secularism in Turkey*, ed. Ahmet Kuru and Alfred Stepan (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), 32–60.

[138] Ayse Gunes-Ayata, "The Republican People's Party," in *Political Parties in Turkey*, ed. Barry Rubin and Metìn Heper (London: Frank Cass and Company Limited, 2002), 102–121.

[139] Ergun Özbudun, "Turkey-Plural Society and Monolithic State," in *Democracy, Islam, and Secularism in Turkey*, ed. Ahmet Kuru and Alfred Stepan (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), 71.

[140] Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, 221–337.

[141] Joost Lagendijk, "Turkey's Accession to the European Union and the Role of the Justice and Development Party," in *Democracy, Islam, and Secularism in Turkey*, by Ahmet Kuru and Alfred Stepan (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), 167–68.

C.   POST-DEMOCRATIC MOBILIZATIONAL AUTHORITARIANISM

As mentioned, mobilization and participation are impossible to sustain in authoritarian regimes and either democracy or authoritarianism could result. In practice, this means that inclusion of entities other than the ruling party must occur in order to ensure longevity of a system.[142] Whether this inclusion involves power-sharing, inspiration and mobilization through totalitarian ideology or the plurality of democracy is immaterial. However, authoritarian regimes can sustain mobilization for a time, and in two different systemic types. The aforementioned post-independence structure accounts for one such system, and post-democratic structure addresses another.[143] This study contends that the post-democratic window has opened in Turkey, and that a post-democratic mobilizational authoritarian regime has formed in the AKP. Characteristics and historical examples of this typology will be addressed, and an attempt will be made to distinguish it from the somewhat similar typology of fascism. At length, if Linz's model holds true, the AKP's reign must end in a return to democracy or descend further into totalitarianism.

Although it is possible to interpret the Turkish system following Atatürk's death as democracy, many refer to the interference of the military as authoritarian given the many coups and the imposition of a military president in 1980.[144] The typology of post-democratic mobilizational authoritarianism asserts that expectations of democratic institutions and rights of participation develop during a state's struggle for independence and during its subsequent period of democracy. The result becomes a level of expectation that disallows bureaucratic-military authoritarian regimes thereafter,[145] and in the case of Turkey it can be said to have created a climate that will allow no further military coups. This sentiment can be seen in the demonstrations of 2007 that involved demonstrators

---

[142] Linz, *Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes*, 166.

[143] Ibid., 176–77.

[144] Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, 278–288.

[145] Linz, *Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes*, 176–77.

with signs reading "No Sharia, No Coup."[146] However, the exposure in question has different effects depending upon which stage of development is occurring.

Linz explains that experiencing liberal environments and political freedoms can lead to different movements, and that the threat of lower class revolution and communism will lead either to democracy or authoritarianism depending upon a mix of pre-existing societal factors. A cited example is France under Bonaparte, as revolution led to a backlash against the lower class and liberalism.[147] Another cited example is the clash of fascist and Leninist movements across Europe during the twentieth century,[148] which also touched Turkey during the 1950s, when the lawlessness and street conflicts between left and right led to a military coup and martial law.[149] Linz's version of events in Western Europe involves a societal life-cycle that sees fascism develop in response to Leninism, and authoritarianism develop in response to both. The threat of communist revolution already addressed, the "ambiguities and contradictions of the fascist utopia" apparently expose it to authoritarian advances.[150] In Turkey, this appears most like the promises of Kemalist modernism, which did not lead to economic prosperity despite the successful maintenance of territorial integrity.[151] Recent economic success and a reduction of income inequality by the AKP[152] has had a large part in allowing the party to advance what Linz would refer to as "limited and muted pluralism."[153]

The kind of populist support allowing limited pluralism is an example of the mobilizational element in the typology, as grass-roots election strategy allows the party to gain power and provide a "channel for some degree and some types of voluntary political

---

[146] Philip Gailey, "Turkey: Islam in a Secular Society," May 27, 2007, http://www.sptimes.com/2007/05/27/news_pf/Opinion/Turkey__Islam_in_a_se.shtml.

[147] Linz, *Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes*, 218.

[148] Ibid., 219.

[149] Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, 241–43.

[150] Linz, *Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes*, 224.

[151] Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, 133–65, 221–277.

[152] "The Rise of Income Inequality amongst Rich Countries," Inequality Watch, February 6, 2012, http://inequalitywatch.eu/spip.php?article58.

[153] Linz, *Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes*, 225.

participation" in the form of rallies.[154] The typology suggests that these shows of public opinion often substitute for electoral pluralism. Discontent with the status quo under disgraced ideologies gives birth to a justification for social change at any cost, and popular will becomes expressed through support for the dominant party regardless of authoritarian behavior. The post-democratic mobilizational authoritarian regime must normally contend with labor movements and powerful leftist forces that threaten to undermine democratic authority. Finally, violence is mentioned as a factor in determining which movements come to power in the clash between fascism, communism, and authoritarianism.[155]

It is pertinent to define fascism so as to separate it from authoritarianism in this typology. What then separates fascism from authoritarianism? Essentially, fascism is a type of totalitarianism. In Linz's view, it employs ideology, extreme nationalism, political forms new to the locale, and a style unique to the regime in question. Additionally, it can be characterized by that which it expunges, which includes liberalism, Marxism, communism, clericalism, capitalism, and the bourgeois. Its ideology often weaves actual historical traditional with the mythological and this is expressed through the unique visuals that accompany the variant's style.[156] Uniforms, art, and other visuals are used to communicate the ideology and inspire followers. Fascism makes utopian promises, and eschews any pluralism.[157] While institutions in fascist and authoritarian regimes are comparable in scope and application, little else is shared between the typologies.

The defining traits of post-democratic mobilizational authoritarianism are its development in contrast to fascism, its populist mobilization in place of true electoral pluralism, and its struggle against leftist or labor-based movements. However, these characteristics must be placed in the context of the individual state. The mobilizational regime must actually arise after or during a democratic period, and as a result of popular

---

[154] Ibid., 226.

[155] Ibid.

[156] Ibid., 220.

[157] Ibid., 224.

expectation of some level of political participation even though this influence will not necessarily be exercised electorally. Finally, the regime must fit the basic mold of authoritarianism, with limited pluralism, non-specific institutions, single-party dominance, mentality, and lack of procedural consensus among the population.

D.   POST-DEMOCRATIC MOBILIZATIONAL AKP?

2014 has seen a series of corruption scandals involving high-level ministers of the AKP regime in Turkey, including Prime Minister Erdogan. These followed hot on the heels of the Gezi Park protests, which began a movement against the AKP spanning nearly a year.[158] Concerns about AKP corruption, crime, and authoritarianism have reached new heights with bans on social media and internet usage. Now, a body of evidence has accumulated that may allow an earnest evaluation of authoritarianism's state in Turkey. Recent events, to include government actions by the AKP, will be evaluated in light of the criteria of Linz's typologies of authoritarianism and post-democratic mobilizational authoritarianism. The general methods of the party will also be addressed. Theoretically, if they fit the model, the AKP may be characterized as an authoritarian regime.

While not connected to recent actions of the AKP, Jenny White's "Islamist Mobilization in Turkey: A Study in Vernacular Politics" covered the inception of the party and its methods for ascending to power in 2002. The book refers to the grass-roots mobilization of differing factions by the AKP as "vernacular politics," and characterizes this tactic in a way similar to what Linz describes.[159] White also describes the Islamist movement as countering the secularist promises of Kemalism in a manner that resembles Linz's description of mobilizational regimes countering fascists.[160] The mentality that she describes is very much rooted in Turkey's predicament at the new millennium mark, which encompasses a societal disagreement about how to proceed economically and with

---

[158] Mustafa Akyol, "Turkey's Doctrine of Pre-Emptive Authoritarianism," *Al-Monitor*, accessed April 27, 2014, http://www.al-monitor.com/pulse/originals/2014/04/authoritarian-turkey-preemptive-erdogan.html; "Adding Injustice to Injury: One Year on from the Gezi Park Protests in Turkey" (Amnesty International, 2014), http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/info/EUR44/010/2014/en, 5–6.

[159] White, *Islamist Mobilization in Turkey*, 6–11.

[160] Ibid., 252–60.

regards to Islam's place in public space. On the whole, the study sets the stage for mobilization of Turkey's many demographics, and accounts for the formation of the state's current regime, if not its ability to maintain power.

A decade later, some scholars were still decrying the outdated nature of the Turkish state structure rather than the aggressive methods of the AKP. In 2012, Ergun Özbudun theorized (and lamented) that despite six decades of reasonably competitive representative pluralism, the political structure of the country still reflected only the "founding philosophy of the Turkish Republic, features of which are incompatible with the development of a truly pluralistic political system."[161] Additionally, he outlined how four distinct political demographics had formed, three of which were geographically based, while only one (the AKP) enjoyed support in multiple regions. Citing a need for constitutional protection of all societal quarters, Özbudun opined that the system's weakness is its failure to provide such protection.[162] His work on the subject addresses single party privilege, a lack of procedural consensus, and particularly a failure to institutionalize pluralism.

In the same year, the Turkish military command forced 40 flag officers into retirement due to charges of plotting an unexecuted coup years before. The move was a continuation of a string of arrests and sacks associated with the "Ergenekon" and "Sledgehammer" trials that saw the chiefs of staff resign in protest in 2011. Ultimately, these investigations spilled over into the civilian sector, as several professors, journalists, and attorneys were also incarcerated (if not charged) in connection with the charges. Traditionally, the military had functioned as a safeguard against fundamentalism in Turkish government, and the "deep state" was usually supported by the populace in this endeavor.[163] The AKP's choice to move against so many military members so long after

---

[161] Ergun Özbudun, "Turkey-Plural Society and Monolithic State," in *Democracy, Islam, and Secularism in Turkey*, ed. Ahmet Kuru and Alfred Stepan (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), 61.

[162] Ibid., 87–88.

[163] "Turkey Retires 40 'Coup Plot' Generals," *BBC News*, accessed March 8, 2014, http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-19127708.

the supposed offences likely indicates an attempt to disgrace the secular ideology of the Kemalists, but clearly indicates the broad powers of nonspecific institutions under the AKP regime.

Following these purges in May of 2013, Erdogan and the AKP passed legislation that banned establishments from selling alcohol during certain hours or even advertising such sales with visible beverages in their windows. Additionally, mosque and school zones were made dry and producers of alcoholic beverages could no longer serve as sponsors of public events. The ostensible reasons for such measures were to prevent public intoxication and alcohol abuse, but OECD research indicated that Turkey already consumed the least alcohol per capita of any European nation.[164] The AKP's ability to ram such legislation through indicates single-party dominance, limited pluralism, and non-specific institutional power. The party's desire to do so certainly indicates a singular mentality and possibly monism. The obvious fulfillment of an Islamist precept in direct opposition to secular principles serves as repudiation of what supporters might perceive in the same fashion as traditional fascist (see Kemalist) utopian beliefs about modern society.

Summer of 2013 saw further inflammation of the Ergenekon trials, as a former commander of the Turkish military was sentenced to life in prison for his supposed role in another plot to overthrow the AKP that was never executed. Additionally, three members of the CHP opposition party serving in parliament were convicted of the same charges and sentenced to between 12 and 35 years imprisonment! The same charges were brought against academics and journalists, and only 21 of 275 were acquitted. The atmosphere of secrecy that descended upon the trials and the banning of families and media from the courtroom led to accusations of improper process. During the trials, security forces fired tear gas canisters at supporters of the defendants demonstrating

---

[164] "Not so Good for You," *The Economist*, June 1, 2013, http://www.economist.com/news/europe/21578657-mildly-islamist-government-brings-tough-alcohol-restrictions-not-so-good-you.

outside of the relevant jail complex.[165] The revocation of the right to free assembly demonstrates lack of procedural consensus, and the seeming determination of the AKP to purge all dissenters from Turkish society demonstrates a desire to limit (if not eliminate) pluralism. Perhaps most salient, the event reveals a desire to use lingering discontent with former regimes to justify social change, even if the change enacted does not meet with broad approval.

Fall of 2013 saw the end of Turkey's ban against the wearing of head scarves in public spaces. The measure had been in place since the time of Ataturk, and its removal was billed as a part of a series of changes aimed at improving human rights and democratic standards. The press pushed the move as a political reward from Erdogan to those center-right voters who had brought the AKP to power. Secularists saw the move as an attempt to introduce more of the Islamist agenda, but the ban had already been removed from universities in 2011 and remains in effect with the military. However, female clothing remains a touchy subject in Turkish affairs and revealing outfits have resulted in the firing of some media employees.[166] Even more than the Ergenekon trials, the removal of the headscarf ban exhibits the use of discontent with prior state philosophy to justify social change.

In November of the same year, multi-partisan efforts to rewrite Turkey's constitution ended in stalemate as the appointed commission terminated its efforts. The restructuring had ostensibly been intended to institutionalize democracy and reform those functions that had allowed military coups in the past. However, an attempt by Erdogan to inject a provision fusing Turkey's executive branch with its presidency led many to believe that the proposed constitutional changes would only end up furthering the power of the AKP. This issue along with the definition of Turkish citizenship led the

---

[165] "Former Turkish General Gets Life in Prison for Erdogan Overthrow Conspiracy," *NBC News*, August 5, 2013, http://www.nbcnews.com/news/world/former-turkish-general-gets-life-prison-erdogan-overthrow-conspiracy-v19876424.

[166] Sebnem Arsu and Dan Bilefsky, "Turkey Lifts Longtime Ban on Head Scarves in State Offices," *The New York Times*, October 8, 2013, sec. World / Europe, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/10/09/world/europe/turkey-lifts-ban-on-head-scarves-in-state-offices.html.

commission to an impasse indicating a lack of procedural consensus.[167] The attempt to reform the constitution also reveals a broad, multi-partisan desire to contradict the assertions of Kemalist philosophy and achieve social change.

In December of 2013 it appeared that a chink in the armor of the AKP was exposed, as three of its ministers resigned due to allegations of business fraud against their families, implying that assistance had been given on the political front. The charges involved permits for construction and development, but the departing ministers had shocking recommendations, saying that Erdogan should step down. The AKP is famous for quelling dissent and handling public relations with an iron fist, so the announcement caused many to believe that Erdogan must be involved to an extent that would be impossible to mask for long.[168] When this is viewed in concert with other actions of the AKP, one starts to see monism in its methods of handling both public relations and dissent. Moreover, the privileged status of the ruling party becomes obvious as it dodges consequences for such events. Of course, non-specific institutions and lack of procedural consensus remain a theme throughout.

A month later in January of 2014, Erdogan fired 350 policemen because they had begun an investigation into AKP corruption without providing advance notice to the government. The investigation was to address bribery of politicians, illegal gold transactions with Iran, and construction permits. Fethullah Gulen was blamed for involvement without substantiation, and the judiciary branch was even accused of attempting a coup.[169] The merits of each set of charges notwithstanding, the events clearly illustrated Linz's references to the penetration of non-specific institutions and a

---

[167] Gulsen Solaker, "Hopes Fade for a New Turkish Constitution," Reuters, November 18, 2013, http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/11/18/us-turkey-constitution-idUSBRE9AH0OV20131118.

[168] Tim Arango, "Corruption Scandal Is Edging Near Turkish Premier," *The New York Times*, December 25, 2013, sec. World / Europe, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/12/26/world/europe/turkish-cabinet-members-resign.html.

[169] "Corruption Scandal in Turkey: PM Erdogan Fires Hundreds of Police Officers and Chiefs / Breaking News," National Turk, accessed March 8, 2014, http://www.nationalturk.com/en/corruption-scandal-in-turkeypm-erdogan-fires-hundreds-of-police-officers-and-chiefs-breaking-news-45919.

lack of procedural consensus not only amongst the populace but between governmental branches. Both indicate authoritarianism per Linz's model, but do not specifically address post-democratic mobilizational tendencies.

In February, President Abdullah Gül signed Internet legislation (with the full support of the AKP) that would provide authority to ban URLs, force service providers to store personal information and provide it to government agencies, and force union membership for service providers. Despite vast public disapproval and the impending Turkish hosting of the annual Internet Governance Forum in September of 2014, Gül did not back off the legislation, although he did promise to immediately engage in amendment.[170] The action served the dual purpose of censoring the press and violating individual privacy at the same time. Again, discontent with modernist ideology is evident, along with a justification for social change via almost any means. Moreover, limited pluralism, monism, non-specific institutions, single-party privilege, mentality, and lack of consensus are all visible in this action. Media censure is traditional evidence of authoritarianism in other models, but fits virtually every criterion of Linz's model, if only one criterion of post-democratic mobilizational regimes.

During the same month, Gül signed a law providing the government (the ministry) greater power over the judiciary, to include appointment and censure. While the president attempted to blunt the impact of the bill by asking for rectification of "15 anti-constitutional points" [171] before finalization, the violation of power separation and judicial autonomy sparked demonstrations in Istanbul and Ankara as government corruption charges had already created fertile ground for such sentiment. Further, opposition leaders claimed that the move was intended as a response to corruption investigations and would be used to prevent successful prosecution of AKP ministers.[172] Although this move presents the appearance of being nothing other than a defensive

---

[170] "Turkish President Signs Controversial Internet Legislation," *Al-Monitor*, accessed June 13, 2014, http://www.al-monitor.com/pulse/originals/2014/02/gul-signs-controversial-internet-bill.html.

[171] "Turkey's President Signs Law Giving Government More Power over Judiciary," *Euronews*, accessed March 6, 2014, http://www.euronews.com/2014/02/27/turkey-s-president-signs-law-giving-government-more-power-over-judiciary/.

[172] Ibid.

maneuver, it still implies monism as the AKP seems to know no other way to maintain power than to grab more. Further, single-party privilege and nonspecific institutions are clear factors. One might also argue that the move demonstrates limited pluralism, but judges are not elected officials and this move is political without involving elections.

In March, the corruption scandal reared its head again, as Erdogan threatened to ban Turkish use of YouTube and Facebook owing to a number of leaks posting information related to the allegations. Additionally, Erdogan accused Gülen supporters of using the sites to poison the country's police and judiciary against the government and acting as a "parallel state." Erdogan also complained that the leaks appeared timed to affect summer elections.[173] Two weeks later, Twitter was officially barred in Turkey as Erdogan condemned social media as "the worst menace to society," owing to its supposed abuse in exposing his officials.[174] In concert with preceding Internet legislation, the ban constituted the most definitive control of the press or information yet undertaken by the regime, and is a superlative example of non-specific institutional power. Given the disapproval the actions met with on all fronts, they certainly reveal a lack of procedural consensus, monism, and maintenance of limited pluralism.

Foreshadowed by Erdogan's comments, March elections in Ankara and Istanbul met with allegations of fraud by opposition parties claiming discrepancies between the results and their counts. The predictable follow-ons were riots and demonstrations in front of Turkey's Supreme Election Council building, accompanied by riot police using water cannons for dispersal. Although the Republican People's Party (CHP) narrowly lost the Ankara election, the demonstrators were comprised of members from multiple parties.[175] The events demonstrated an attempt to keep order consistent with a post-democratic regime's prevention of leftist undermining of the authority of the state. Of course, monism, limited pluralism, and lack of procedural consensus were also evident.

---

[173] "Turkey Warns YouTube and Facebook Could Be Banned," *The Express Tribune with the International New York Times*, accessed June 18, 2014, http://tribune.com.pk/story/680033/turkey-warns-youtube-and-facebook-could-be-banned/.

[174] Eliana Dockterman, "Turkey Bans Twitter," *TIME*, accessed April 5, 2014, http://time.com/32864/turkey-bans-twitter/.

[175] "Turkish Party Disputes Local Election Results," Bigstory AP, April 1, 2014, http://bigstory.ap.org/article/turkish-party-disputes-local-election-results.

Following these "victories," the Prime Minister dubbed the results "a mandate to hunt down enemies within the state 'in their lair.'"[176] Referring to dissenters as "traitors, terrorists, and an alliance of evil," Erdogan made it clear that he viewed the election results as a blank check to persecute such opponents.[177] "They will be brought to account. From tomorrow, there may be some who flee."[178] Not mincing any words, he made it clear that he considered this a matter of national security and that the AKP would employ whatever action was deemed necessary to quell opposition. The statements exhibited every characteristic of Linz's typologies of authoritarianism and post-democratic mobilizational authoritarianism.

Then in May, the AKP decided to maintain its three-term limit for the Prime Ministry, indicating that Erdogan would continue on to the presidential office despite an earlier failure to strengthen the office's powers. The implication is that since August's election will be the first time that Turkey's president will be popularly elected, the AKP will be looking for another electoral mandate to solidify power even further.[179] Such a mandate might serve the same function as Linz's mobilizational tenet of populist participation without direct impact on legislative matters. It certainly would continue the trends of limited pluralism, monism, single-party dominance, and singular mentality.

E.   CONCLUSIONS

In April of this year, Al-Monitor posted an article on "Turkey's Doctrine of Pre-Emptive Authoritarianism." In it, Mustafa Akyol noted that the increasingly authoritarian behavior of Minister Erdogan might appear irrational to outside observers, but that in fact it is in line with a Turkish mentality regarding political confrontation. This mentality asserts that one should meet every such confrontation in a strong, defiant, and aggressive

---

[176] Humeyra Pamuk and Nick Tattersall, "Erdogan Targets Enemies after Poll Triumph," Reuters, March 31, 2014, http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/03/31/us-turkey-election-idUSBREA2R12X20140331.

[177] Ibid.

[178] Ibid.

[179] "Politics—Turkish PM Hints at Presidential Run, as Ruling AKP Maintains Decisions," *Hurriyet Daily News*, accessed May 7, 2014, http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/turkish-pm--hints-at-presidential-run-as-ruling-akp-maintains-decisions.aspx?pageID=238&nID=65931&NewsCatID=338.

manner. Effectively, it implies that all political confrontations are battles and that political opponents are enemies. Given such a perspective, pre-emptive action is best, because your enemy will attempt to do the same whenever able.[180] Others argue that endless branding of opponents as traitors and Kemalists is the most authoritarian aspect of the AKP's behavior.[181] Still others find the AKP's attempts to control media and education the most disturbing, as the former are censored and the latter are manipulated to the point of shutting down college preparatory courses that do not mesh with the party agenda. The international community is most appalled by a combination of the media banning and possible illegal transactions with Iran.[182] Notwithstanding the merits of these accusations and characterizations, scholars and journalists are describing the AKP's actions as authoritarian, and describing a singular mentality similar to the one outlined in Linz's model.

In summary, every characteristic outlined in Linz's typologies of authoritarianism and post-democratic mobilizational authoritarianism has been exhibited by the AKP. Nonspecific institutions have been utilized to penetrate all aspects of life and prevent political pluralism, while monism has been visible in efforts to maintain single party privilege. Jenny White has pointed out that the AKP is a fusion of demographics, but it has not fused the interests of multiple parties, preferring a monolithic structure to go with its varied base. A singular mentality has been employed rather than ideology unique to the party, and the result in Turkish society is a lack of procedural consensus. Populist mobilization, backlashes against Kemalism, and accusations that other movements attempt to undermine the authority of the state have all been evident, even though the latter accusations are reminiscent of Kemalist behavior. Attempts to reform the Turkish constitution have been made, ostensibly to prevent authoritarianism. Critics claim that the

---

[180] Mustafa Akyol, "Turkey's Doctrine of Pre-Emptive Authoritarianism," *Al-Monitor*, accessed April 27, 2014, http://www.al-monitor.com/pulse/originals/2014/04/authoritarian-turkey-preemptive-erdogan.html.

[181] "Reports of Turkey's Authoritarianism Are Not Greatly Exaggerated," opendemocracy, accessed April 27, 2014, http://www.opendemocracy.net/arab-awakening/cemal-burak-tansel/reports-of-turkey%E2%80%99s-authoritarianism-are-not-greatly-exaggerated.

[182] "Turkey's Fading Democracy," *Huffington Post*, February 10, 2014, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/alp-aslandogan/turkeys-fading-democracy_b_4733996.html.

attempts were made to institutionalize the AKP's agenda. How then has the party exceeded or deviated from the mandate in Turkey's current charter?

V.   CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT?

The recent failure of a Turkish commission to come to an agreement regarding constitutional reform was touted as increasing the importance of the 2015 parliamentary elections. This is because the inability of the team to reach a compromise will be rendered meaningless if the AKP can achieve a parliamentary majority and pass reforms unopposed. Constitutional reform was a promise of Erdogan's campaign for a third term, and theoretically would have allowed multi-partisan restructuring that could have cemented "democratic freedoms" and put "further distance" between the present and "the era of military coups."[183] More importantly, it would have allowed the AKP to institutionalize its agenda and consolidate the systemic changes it has introduced regarding the military and the judiciary. While the requirements of the EU to democratize and make changes in order to join have served as a convenient explanation for attempted structural change, recent cited actions of the AKP belie the stated purpose to liberalize. Why then is the AKP attempting to change the constitution? This can be answered by examining attempted changes in concert with how party actions have deviated from an existing mandate. Problems of constitutional examination will be addressed, followed by a timeline and characterization of constitutional events in Turkey. Then, a comparison will be made between AKP actions and a constitutional mandate, ending with an address of thwarted hopes for revision. The issue at the heart of such a comparison is that constitutional violation is a direct indication of authoritarianism and not democracy. This is so because a charter is a necessary step in attaining rule of law rather than rule by law. This study argues that constitutional blockage of authoritarianism (whether based on an Islamist platform or not) is a primary political factor that also blocks the agenda of the AKP.

---

[183] Gulsen Solaker, "Hopes Fade for a New Turkish Constitution," Reuters, November 18, 2013, http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/11/18/us-turkey-constitution-idUSBRE9AH0OV20131118.

A.   CONSTITUTIONAL TIMELINE OF TURKEY

1921—System enacted during the war of independence, parliament held all relevant power

1924—This constitution added executive and judicial powers, and provided further definition on presidential power

1937—First large amendment package installing the six main principles of the republic in constitutional law: republicanism, nationalism, populism, statism, secularism, and reformism

1961—A new constitution fully separated the judiciary from the other branches, and effectively enacted the principle of separation of powers, also introduced the constitutional court

1982—The last constitution, this version abolished the republican senate, reduced required quorum for legislative action, provided the executive branch with powers disassociated from the Assembly, judicial power was limited[184]

1995, 2001, 2002, 2004, 2010—Numerous liberalizing amendments to the Constitution, along with the "harmonization packages" of 2002–2004[185]

B.   TURKISH CONSTITUTIONALITY

A prime example of the AKP's interest in constitutional revision comes from the events that befell Tayyip Erdogan in 1998 following his famous Islamist speech. He was convicted to serve a term in the penitentiary for having violated article 312 of Turkey's criminal code, which dealt with "hate speech on the basis of differences of social class, race, religion, sect or region a criminal offence."[186] More important than this result to the AKP was the importance of article 76 of the 1982 Constitution regarding "eligibility to be

---

[184] "The Republican Era Constitutions," accessed March 5, 2014, http://www.mfa.gov.tr/constitution-of-the-republic-of-turkey.en.mfa#bm2.

[185] William Hale and Ergun Özbudun, *Islamism, Democracy and Liberalism in Turkey: The Case of the AKP* (Oxon, England: Routledge, 2010), 39-61; Ergun Özbudun, "The Turkish Constitutional Court and Political Crisis," in *Democracy, Islam, and Secularism in Turkey*, ed. Ahmet Kuru and Alfred Stepan (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), 149–65.

[186] Hale and Özbudun, *Islamism, Democracy and Liberalism in Turkey*, 55.

a deputy."[187] The verbiage excludes those who have demonstrated "involvement in ideological and anarchistic activities, and incitement and encouragement of such activities."[188] The court found that Erdogan had done so and incited "people to hatred and hostility."[189] All of this was ostensibly in response to his recitation of a poem, and the amendment adopted in December of 2002, after the AKP's electoral victory, is easily explained by this event. It replaced the verbiage "ideological and anarchistic actions," with the words "terror actions."[190] Scholars were pleased with the more concrete definition of prohibited action (not that terrorism is so easily defined), and the move was supported by Turkey's primary opposition party despite being advantageous to the AKP.[191]

"When the Grand National Assembly originally gathered at Angora in April, 1920, it claimed moral and political authority from a verse in the Koran enjoining followers of the Prophet to 'meet together in council and discuss.'"[192] The irony that a secularist charter began under such auspices cannot be understated. For in 1924, the Grand National Assembly abolished the Caliphate and exiled the Caliph, along with the official place of Sharia in state government.[193] Thus was the Constitution of 1924 enacted, and Turkey "provided herself with the machinery of a democratic republic."[194] While republican, constitutional tradition extending back to the Young Turks and late Sultans,[195] the official inception of the republic made the Turkish constitution binding.

Turkey's 1982 Constitution itself is characterized by the state's Ministry of Foreign Affairs as a continuation of the structure used in prior charters. A notable change

---

[187] "Constitution of the Republic of Turkey," November 7, 1982, http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/3ae6b5be0.html.

[188] Ibid.

[189] Hale and Özbudun, *Islamism, Democracy and Liberalism in Turkey*, 55.

[190] Ibid.

[191] Ibid.

[192] Edward Meade Earle, "The New Constitution of Turkey," *Political Science Quarterly* 40, no. 1 (1925): 76.

[193] Ibid., 85.

[194] Ibid., 88.

[195] Ibid., 76–85.

introduced in the 1982 version was the abolition of the Republican Senate. Additionally, in order to prevent impasses like the one that would occur in the presidential election of 2007 (detailed later in this chapter), the minimum quorum for election of the Speaker of the House was reduced to one-third the total of the Assembly. A run-off electoral system was established for the president, in which it was required that a majority be achieved by the fourth ballot, or parliament would have to be re-elected. Executive powers were increased to include the right to sack any minister, and such powers would be constitutional in nature. Judiciary power was to be limited and monitored, particularly with respect to the Constitution. Perhaps most important given the origin of this constitution in a coup, the National Security Council would function as the Presidential Council for six years from the date upon which the Assembly began operation.[196] The latter provision was one of several that civilian leaders found so galling, as it provided the military a tutelary role that would also prevent (along with several other issues) EU accession.

A notable feature of Turkish constitutionality has been the regularity of amendment and/or rewrite. One of the first and most relevant amendments to the Turkish constitution occurred in 1995, as this amendment began the process of inclusion with regard to civic organizations. Membership and creation of political parties was made simpler, the required age for party participation and voting was lowered to 18, and prior university involvement was no longer disqualifying for work or membership in a party. Foreign, female, and youth branches were all permitted anew, and involvement with professional organizations and interests was now permitted. Not only this, but civil employees were now allowed to form their own unions. Perhaps most interesting was the provision to allow prisoners to continue voting despite incarceration.[197] Ostensibly, all of this was done to encourage greater participation in the political process and by volume the amendment must have succeeded in this regard.

---

[196] "The Republican Era Constitutions," accessed March 5, 2014, http://www.mfa.gov.tr/constitution-of-the-republic-of-turkey.en.mfa#bm2.

[197] Arda Can Kumbaracibasi, *Turkish Politics and the Rise of the AKP: Dilemmas of Institutionalization and Leadership Strategy* (Oxon, England: Routledge, 2009), 42.

Levent Gönenç addresses the 2001 amendments enacted by the Grand National Assembly as a crucial step in the process of liberalization, claiming that they did more than the many amendments before to eliminate authoritarian elements from the 1982 constitution. Moreover, the 2001 amendments did the most to eliminate continuing military interference by curtailing temporary article 15 of the 1982 constitution, which prohibited the constitutional contestation of legislation and decrees passed by the military between 1980 and 1983. Further, articles 86 and 69, which administrated political bans on prior politicians (particularly with Necmettin Erbakan in mind) and closed political parties, were contested. The sum of the amendments reduced military power substantially in an attempt to measure up to EU requirements and Copenhagen criteria.[198]

The 2002 amendment has already been addressed, but the amendments of 2004 were more extensive and important. The 10 articles of the amendment presented a variety of weighty matters. The death penalty was abolished so as to allow Turkey's ratification of the 13th Additional Protocol to the European Convention on Human Rights. Article 90 determined that international agreements would take precedence over domestic law, assuring that European Human Rights applications could be facilitated more easily. Moreover, Article 38 stipulated that extradition was now permitted, and that Turkey could be party to the International Criminal Court. Also along legal lines, the State Security Courts conceived in 1973 were abolished. This was done to prevent military judges with different tenures and motivations from mingling with public prosecutors in judgment of those violating state security. The move allowed Turkish compliance with Article 6 of the European Court of Human Rights judicial requirements. Additionally, the 2004 amendment eliminated military representation from the Board of Higher Education and subjected the military to the Court of Accounts, from which it had been exempted by the 1982 Constitution. Article 10 was altered to allow for affirmative action, and Article

---

[198] Levent Gönenç, "The 2001 Amendments to the 1982 Constitution of Turkey," *Ankara Law Review* 1, no. 1 (2004): 89–109, http://auhf.ankara.edu.tr/journals/alr-archive/ALR-2004-01-01/ALR-2004-01-01-Gonenc.pdf.

76 was changed to lower the age for participation in parliament.[199] In sum, the 2004 amendments liberalized Turkey and brought her more into line with European convention.

At the same time as the 2004 amendments, the so-called "harmonization packages" were implemented.[200] These reform efforts were also intended to bring Turkish law into compliance with the Copenhagen criteria and likewise alter Turkish legislation to conform to the new constitutional amendments. Seven primary reforms were enacted via the nine different packages that were installed between 2002 and 2004.[201] Freedom of expression was expanded by altering articles of the criminal code that addressed insulting the state, inciting hostility, and criticism, while prison terms for violating these articles were shortened.[202] Freedom of association was improved via newfound permissions for organizations to operate abroad, while restrictions on Non-Governmental Organizations were loosened to remove the need for government authorizations. Freedom to assemble was also expanded by lessening the delays that governors could apply to demonstrations while newly allowing foreigners to participate in such functions. Religious freedoms were enlarged by allowing non-Muslim charities to begin acquisition of property and construct places of worship. Human rights were also institutionalized through permitting the European Court of Human Rights to authorize retrials in cases of state abuse, and in the form of legislation to prevent torture and maltreatment. This was accomplished by holding individuals liable for damages found by the Court, allowing public prosecutors to litigate against torturers without state permission, and holding the state liable for damages caused by the terror (or anti-terror) acts of government employees. Minority rights were upheld and long-standing Turkish tradition was overturned by allowing public use of local languages other than Turkish, to include the broadcast thereof. Finally, military power was weakened by curtailing the power of the National Security Council. This was achieved by divesting its Secretary

---

[199] Hale and Özbudun, *Islamism, Democracy and Liberalism in Turkey*, 56–57.

[200] Ibid., 57.

[201] Ibid.

[202] Ibid., 58.

General of executive power, lessening the frequency of its assembly, subjecting it to the financial supervision of the Court of Accounts, and eliminating the need for a military member to serve as Secretary General.[203] On the whole, the harmonization packages were effective in expanding individual and organizational rights, and in lessening military power.

Then, in 2007, Turkey faced a constitutional crisis due to the Assembly's impasse over electing a president. The AKP had achieved a parliamentary majority, but would not be able to apply it to all of the scheduled electoral rounds. For this reason, the CHP (primary opposition party) applied to the Constitutional Court to rule that a two-thirds majority was necessary to even open the electoral session. This was granted, whereupon a new election was required, but before this could be achieved the AKP proposed a constitutional amendment that would (among other things) allow popular election of the president and the opening of electoral sessions with only one-third of member approval. Again the CHP, and the outgoing president, appealed to the Constitution Court, but this time the legislation was upheld. The Assembly subsequently passed the bill with a 68.95 per cent approval and 67.51 per cent attendance.[204] Throughout the process, the Armed Forces posted announcements on the website indicating interest and an ongoing role in guarding the secularist nature of the republic, ostensibly due to the Islamist background of the AKP. The polarization of Turkish society that resulted from these events was based on the fears of what some call Turkey's "secularist state elites."[205] The AKP's following parliamentary landslide victory and subsequent repeal of the headscarf ban in public space seemed to confirm those fears.[206] The constitutional crisis itself confirmed Kemalist willingness to use any and all political tools to prevent Islamist power.

The Constitutional Court's final ruling to allow the AKP to amend the constitution seems surprising when taken in concert with other rulings of the era. In the view of Ergun Özbudun, the court demonstrated blatant intolerance for "Islamist parties,"

---

[203] Ibid., 59–61.

[204] Ibid., 39–40.

[205] Ibid., 40.

[206] Ibid.

as evidenced by its having closed five and depriving the AKP of half of its state subsidies.[207] Other cited decisions indicating active support of Kemalism include one regarding the needed parliamentary quorum to open an electoral session, an annulment of the AKP's lifting of the headscarf ban, and a ruling that the AKP had become a "focal point of anti-secular activities."[208] While the latter claim was undoubtedly correct and proscribed by the constitution, Özbudun apparently found the discrimination inherent in such a ruling to indicate secularism beyond even that "in any Western democracy."[209]

The final amendment was applied to the Turkish Constitution in 2010 and altered or removed 24 articles, while adding two. The measure received a supporting vote of 58 percent of the Assembly, and was considered highly controversial due to changes made to the composition of the Constitutional Court and the High Council of Judges and Public Prosecutors, although the controversy seems predictable given the deadlock that had occurred in the crisis of 2007. Parliament and particularly the president benefitted from the growth of already strong roles in selecting members of these bodies, with the latter becoming involved in selecting 14 of 17 such personnel under the new amendment. Theoretically, this move was to prevent unilateral governmental action on the part of the courts, and this was supposed to put Turkey in line with European standards. Increasing executive power over the judiciary can obviously have negative effects on the separation of powers. Perhaps ironically, other planks of the amendment included the introduction of new protection of personal data, affirmative action, increases in union rights, and the abolition of judicial immunity for certain personnel.[210] Taken in sum, the amendment did provide liberalization in a manner that should have put Turkey in line for European membership, but power was further concentrated in the executive and legislative branches, while military and judiciary power were further lessened.

---

[207] Özbudun, "The Turkish Constitutional Court and Political Crisis," 149–65.

[208] Ibid., 159–160.

[209] Ibid., 161.

[210] Ibid., 161–163.

C. MANDATE VERSUS ACTIONS

How then does the AKP measure up to the constitutional mandate it is required to obey and has helped to define? Six of the nine harmonization packages intended to liberalize Turkey and meet Copenhagen criteria were enacted under the party's rule.[211] In order to determine the AKP's performance with regard to constitutional mandate, its recent actions (not coincidentally the ones inspiring fears of authoritarianism) shall be matched against the most recent constitutional provisions (whether original or amended) that treat the relevant issues. The primary issues include whether the AKP has violated the constitution on matters of expression, assembly, civil-military relations, and the rights and powers of parties and governmental offices. The results of such a comparison should establish whether the AKP is meeting its mandate or its stated objectives, along with whether the party is now authoritarian in nature (whatever its origins or the nature of Islamist parties, the ranks of which it has long since departed in means and character).

On matters of expression, the Turkish constitution as amended on October 3, 2001 protects the "freedom of communication" and says that "privacy of communication is fundamental."[212] Further, it details that without judicial finding, curtailing of this right is not to be undertaken unless "prescribed by law" for the purposes of certain public organizations.[213] With regard to "freedom of expression and dissemination of thought," article 26 states that thought and opinions may be communicated via any media means, and (as amended on October 2, 2001) the only factors that shall be permitted to interfere include "national security, public order, public safety, safeguarding the basic characteristics of the Republic and the indivisible integrity of the State with its territory and nation, preventing crime, punishing offenders, withholding information duly classified as a state secret, protecting the reputation or rights and private and family life of others, or protecting professional secrets as prescribed by law, or ensuring the proper

---

[211] Hale and Özbudun, *Islamism, Democracy and Liberalism in Turkey*, 57.

[212] "Constitution of the Republic of Turkey" (Turkiye Buyuk Millet Meclisi), accessed June 27, 2014, http://global.tbmm.gov.tr/docs/constitution_en.pdf, 11.

[213] Ibid.

functioning of the judiciary."[214] With regard to the freedom of the press, articles 28-31 prohibit censorship, require state assurance of such freedom, prohibit bans on reporting, and assure individual and party rights to use mass media. Finally, article 31 states that "the law shall not impose restrictions preventing the public from receiving information or accessing ideas and opinions through these media, or preventing public opinion from being freely formed, on the grounds other than national security, public order, or the protection of public morals and health."[215]

As has been cited, the AKP violated these provisions for free expression with multiple acts. First, this occurred via the institution of legislation in May of 2013 that banned establishments from advertising alcohol sales with visible beverages in their windows. Second, as has been mentioned, charges of treason were brought against academics and journalists for conspiring with military members to attempt a coup that was never executed. Third, internet legislation was enacted that banned URLs, forced service providers to store personal information and provide it to the ministry, and forced union membership for those same companies. Fourth, Twitter was banned by Erdogan due to supposed abuse of social media channels, even though such a move was outside his authority per the constitution.[216] Finally, the AKP termed victorious election results "a mandate to hunt down enemies within the state 'in their lair.'"[217] As a whole, the above actions demonstrate violation of constitutional mandate and judicial prerogative.

With regard to freedom of assembly, article 33 (as amended in 2010) provides the right, subject to the issues of "national security, public order, prevention of commission or continuation of a crime, or an arrest."[218] Perhaps more importantly, only the decisions of the judiciary can suspend or delay this right.[219] However, this is subject to the

---

[214] Ibid., 12.

[215] Ibid., 13–15.

[216] Eliana Dockterman, "Turkey Bans Twitter | TIME," *TIME*, accessed April 5, 2014, http://time.com/32864/turkey-bans-twitter/.

[217] Humeyra Pamuk and Nick Tattersall, "Erdogan Targets Enemies after Poll Triumph," Reuters, March 31, 2014, http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/03/31/us-turkey-election-idUSBREA2R12X20140331.

[218] Ibid., 16.

[219] Ibid.

interpretation of the following article, which provides loose grounds for violation thereof by the acting government. Article 34 states that freedom to assemble may be constrained due to the aforementioned needs and "protection of public health and public morals."[220] Regarding the same issue (and several incidents of protest against the AKP), article 141 states that court hearings are to be available to the general public, but are also subject to issues of "public morals or public security."[221] Further room for government restriction of rights is provided in article 14, which allows the government to guard the "indivisible integrity of the State with its territory and nation," by violating fundamental rights and freedoms.[222]

Due to the wide latitude provided by the loose verbiage mentioned above, it is difficult to claim that freedom of assembly, as provided for in the Turkish Constitution, was violated by the AKP. As has already been detailed, March 2014 elections in Ankara and Istanbul were wrought with accusations of fraud by the opposition. The demonstrations that followed in front of the Supreme Election Council building were dispersed by riot police utilizing water cannons. Although the protestors consisted of participants from multiple parties, the AKP's rhetoric labeled them as CHP dissidents.[223] It was not difficult to spin the occurrence as a threat to public order, national security, and public morals. Less easy to explain from a constitutional perspective were Erdogan's words regarding opponents following the elections. His unveiled threats towards dissenters were unequivocal: "They will be brought to account. From tomorrow, there may be some who flee."[224] This was tantamount to a direct violation of freedom to assemble and political liberalism, as it effectively implied an electoral mandate for single-party dominance and the end of pluralism in Turkish politics.

Given the Ergenekon and Sledgehammer trials that have already been addressed, the Constitution's treatment of civil-military relations is pivotal to an analysis of whether

---

[220] Ibid.

[221] Ibid., 71.

[222] Ibid., 6.

[223] "Turkish Party Disputes Local Election Results," The Big Story AP, April 1, 2014, http://bigstory.ap.org/article/turkish-party-disputes-local-election-results.

[224] Ibid.

the AKP has exceeded its mandate. This treatment can be best discerned by outlining those segments of the constitution altered by the AKP via amendment or repeal. In the latter case, article 24 of the 2010 amendment package removed provisional article 15 of the 1982 constitution and with it legal immunity for those military members and bureaucratic officials that led the 1980 coup.[225] The move allowed for the aforementioned trials, and the AKP used them to subjugate the military to its authority. The same amendment package saw a change to article 145, which removed all military judicial authority over civilians and subjected cases involving national security or constitutional order to civilian courts as well.[226] Military judicial independence was further hamstrung by the 2010 amendments to articles 156 and 157, which addressed the military court of appeals and its administrative court. The changes continued to shrink military autonomy by subjecting the bodies to civilian law.[227] In sum, the 2010 amendments were part of the AKP's bid to end military influence on the government as a whole. When taken in tandem with the prosecution of generals, the amendments were effective in this regard. However, the AKP's ability to modify the constitution to this end indicated a societal willingness to alter the constitutional mandate for this purpose. In this case at least, the AKP had no need to exceed a pre-existing charter.

Regarding rights and powers of governmental office, it must be said there are multiple levels of constitutional treatment. However, executive and judicial powers, along with the stated separation of religion from politics are most pertinent. Article 24 states that "no one shall be allowed to exploit or abuse religion or religious feelings… for the purpose of person or political interest or influence."[228] This seems to explicitly forbid the very existence of religious, and therefore Islamist, parties. Such a provision addresses the types of organizations allowed to participate in politics, as opposed to the powers of offices themselves. With regard to the latter, the constitution states in article 112 that the

---

[225] Levent Gonenc, *2010 Proposed Constitutional Amendments to the 1982 Constitution of Turkey* (Economic Policy Research Foundation of Turkey, September 2010), 1.

[226] "Constitution of the Republic of Turkey" (Turkiye Buyuk Millet Meclisi), accessed June 27, 2014, http://global.tbmm.gov.tr/docs/constitution_en.pdf, 72.

[227] Ibid., 81–82.

[228] Ibid., 11.

sum total of the Prime Minister's powers lies in the supervision of the Council of Ministers, and in assuring that the Council acts in accordance with law and the Constitution.[229] All other executive powers lie in the office of the President, who is still subject to law as produced by legislation and interpreted by the judiciary.[230] The latter's independence is established in articles 9 and 138,[231] and is not to be infringed upon by any "organ, authority, office or individual."[232] Furthermore, discussion by the Assembly regarding judicial action is not permitted. In an attempt to give itself more control over the judiciary given investigations into its corruption, the AKP introduced an amendment in 2010 to allow the Ministry of Justice to supervise public prosecutors administratively, but even this remains "regulated by law," and the resulting impact is therefore variable.[233] The Constitutional Court's purview was increased by this amendment to include the ability to try military members, but notably, the Grand Assembly was granted judicial review authority over Court decisions![234] This creates a circular issue of judicial authority and violates judicial independence addressed elsewhere in the Constitution.

As prosecution of criminal acts is not a function of the Ministry in Turkish law (even notwithstanding 2010 constitutional amendments providing the Ministry of Justice with oversight of public prosecutors), the Ergenekon and Sledgehammer trials cannot legally have been initiated by the AKP as controlling party of the Grand Assembly. Yet, it forced 40 flag officers into retirement due to charges of plotting a coup in the early 2000s. The inclusion of civilian targets directly violated the separation of powers as even executive privilege does not cover the actions. Professors, journalists, and attorneys were all imprisoned and rarely charged in connection with the coup accusations.[235] More blatantly in violation of power separation, three members of the CHP opposition party

---

[229] Ibid., 55.

[230] Ibid., 50–53.

[231] Ibid., 4, 70.

[232] Ibid., 70.

[233] Ibid., 72.

[234] Ibid., 77.

[235] "Turkey Retires 40 'Coup Plot' Generals," *BBC News*, accessed March 8, 2014, http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-19127708.

serving in parliament were convicted of treason and given varying sentences.[236] In early 2014, Erdogan also sacked 350 law officers due to an investigation into AKP corruption begun without the provision of notice to the government. The particulars have already been mentioned, but regardless of these the judiciary was counter-accused by the AKP of attempting a coup.[237] All of the mentioned acts demonstrate violation of constitutional mandate regarding the separation of powers and the scope of office.

D. CONCLUSIONS

Despite widespread Turkish hopes for constitutional revision that might have led to procedural consensus, the AKP has been unable to translate its agenda into an electoral majority.[238] Its voting plurality has allowed it to alter a great deal of the 1982 constitution, as nine of the 16 amendments have occurred under the AKP's rule.[239] An increasing portion of voters have favored the AKP due to perceived progress as has been proven by the recent elections. However, repeated violations of constitutional provisions power-separations have been committed by the party due to a perceived electoral mandate.[240] This makes little sense given the AKP's role in establishing the most recent iterations of these provisions, but the notion is that electoral mandate exceeds constitutional mandate. The World Justice Project defines the rule of law as describing a system that holds its leaders accountable and produces publicized, stable, and justifiable laws. Moreover, these laws must be instituted and enforced fairly by justice officials whose constituency reflects the makeup of their community. In Turkey's instance, an electoral mandate based upon a plurality and leading to the enforcement of laws to the

---

[236] "Former Turkish General Gets Life in Prison for Erdogan Overthrow Conspiracy," *NBC News*, August 5, 2013, http://www.nbcnews.com/news/world/former-turkish-general-gets-life-prison-erdogan-overthrow-conspiracy-v19876424.

[237] "Corruption Scandal in Turkey: PM Erdogan Fires Hundreds of Police Officers and Chiefs / Breaking News," National Turk, accessed March 8, 2014, http://www.nationalturk.com/en/corruption-scandal-in-turkeypm-erdogan-fires-hundreds-of-police-officers-and-chiefs-breaking-news-45919.

[238] Gulsen Solaker, "Hopes Fade for a New Turkish Constitution," Reuters, November 18, 2013, http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/11/18/us-turkey-constitution-idUSBRE9AH0OV20131118.

[239] Levent Gönenç, *2010 Proposed Constitutional Amendments to the 1982 Constitution of Turkey* (Economic Policy Research Foundation of Turkey, September 2010), 1.

[240] Humeyra Pamuk and Nick Tattersall, "Erdogan Targets Enemies after Poll Triumph," Reuters, March 31, 2014, http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/03/31/us-turkey-election-idUSBREA2R12X20140331.

ruling party's benefit hardly qualifies the state as one in which the rule of law is prevalent. The notion of an electoral mandate justifying these violations proves tantamount to discounting the rule of law.[241] Scholars have decried the failure of the old Kemalist political elite to democratize itself owing to a self-centered world view.[242] It does not appear that the AKP varies from this formula despite a different attitude towards secularism.

---

[241] "What Is the Rule of Law? The World Justice Project," May 9, 2012, http://www.worldjusticeproject.org/what-rule-law.

[242] Barry Rubin and Metìn Heper, eds., *Political Parties in Turkey* (London: Frank Cass and Company Limited, 2002), 138.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

VI.   AUTHORITARIAN, BUT DIFFERENT?

Turkey's status as a NATO member and its geographical and cultural position as the bridge between Europe and Asia make it strategically significant. Moreover, Turkey's role as a moderate Muslim state has made it extremely important to U.S. efforts in the region. It can arguably be called a regional hegemon. These factors, in addition to its secular government, have amounted to an unusually high level of Western tolerance for recent illiberal behavior on the part of the AKP. Does this behavior indicate authoritarianism and does it indicate long-term change for the state and region? The evidence seems to indicate the former but perhaps not the latter. The import of such changes will weigh heavily on policy makers as the U.S. attempts to redefine its role in the region owing to mounting fiscal constraints and shifting priorities. The ability of Western officials to interpret Turkish events in the proper context will determine effectiveness of regional policy.

This thesis sought to answer whether the AKP is transforming Turkey into an authoritarian state. The evidence indicates that the AKP *is* engaging in authoritarian practices. It is the assessment of the European Union that Turkey has not yet met the Copenhagen criteria for accession, indicating a belief that Turkey has not overcome authoritarian tendencies[243] originating during the period of its founding.[244] As demonstrated, these practices included excessive levels of military power, but now a lack of judicial independence and power separation is evident. Here it is asserted that attempts at constitutional revision stand with the AKP's efforts to seize power from law-enforcement and the judiciary (two segments of government that the AKP did not already control prior to the constitution talks or recent corruption scandals). To show this, Juan Linz's model of mobilizational authoritarian government was matched to the case of Turkey, and the regime of the AKP appears to fit. Further, it was shown that the AKP has deviated directly and often from Turkish constitutional mandate, even after having

---

[243] "Accession Criteria (Copenhagen Criteria)," accessed July 29, 2014, http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/glossary/accession_criteria_copenhague_en.htm.

[244] Erik Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History*, 3rd ed. (London: I.B. Tauris, 2004), 186.

amended it to be more liberal.[245] However, Linz's model of post-independence mobilizational authoritarianism was also shown to fit Turkey under the Kemalists, which covers the entire period of Turkey's history prior to the AKP's ascent. The implication is that Turkey is moving from authoritarianism to authoritarianism rather than from democracy to authoritarianism. Although a period of greater liberty did exist between the two authoritarian periods, at no point did Turkey meet all internationally accepted criteria for consolidated democracy.

Democratic ideology asserts that governmental legitimacy only derives from the consent of the governed, and this consent must be institutionalized by law and observed from regime to regime in order to consolidate a democracy.[246] The efforts of the AKP to rewrite Turkey's constitution indicate an understanding of these concepts, but they do not indicate a democratic agenda. The failure of the constitutional committee to reach an agreement makes attempts at permanent institutionalization moot for the time being, but the AKP may yet garner enough support to push changes through in the face of partisan resistance.[247] If the AKP uses such support to institutionalize a non-democratic agenda, isolation from the West will result, but the maintenance of power in Turkey is the AKP's primary goal. Such a development would not represent a fundamentally new order in Turkey given the authoritarian origins of the state under Ataturk.

Regardless of Turkey's origins, the AKP's course assures that Turkey will not join the European Union for the foreseeable future, as the EU will not accept media censure or violation of power separation. It is more difficult to determine the future of its NATO status, but the AKP remains popular in Turkey due to the economic successes it has achieved. While Turkey's income inequality was measured by the Gini coefficient at 0.49 in 1995, it had dropped to 0.41 by 2008, after only 6 years of AKP economic policy

---

[245] Özbudun, "The Turkish Constitutional Court and Political Crisis," 149–65.

[246] John Locke, "An Essay Concerning Human Understanding," 1690, http://www2.hn.psu.edu/faculty/jmanis/locke/humanund.pdf; "Declaration of Independence - Text Transcript," accessed July 30, 2014, http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/declaration_transcript.html.

[247] Gulsen Solaker, "Hopes Fade for a New Turkish Constitution," Reuters, November 18, 2013, http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/11/18/us-turkey-constitution-idUSBRE9AH0OV20131118.

that has also benefitted the economy as a whole.[248] The recession that the rest of the world has entered during the last five years has been a period of economic boom for Turkey under the AKP's watch. Voters are unlikely to vote out a party that has managed to cultivate such success. Although this will prevent official inclusion in the European Union, economic ties between Turkey and the EU have developed regardless.

The United States remains necessarily neutral and silent on several recent Turkish events that have drawn media attention and criticism. While some may view this as acceptance of authoritarian behavior,[249] it is more likely that fiscal constraints and the lack of a contingency plan prevent the U.S. from giving up on its model of democracy in the Middle East. Although warnings against the use of force by minority-controlled governments have recently been issued by the U.S., (as in the case of Ukraine's former Russian-supported regime)[250] Western interference has not been forthcoming in Turkey. Ostensibly, this is because its government is legitimately elected and it is more difficult to challenge the actions of an elected government than it is to challenge those of an invader or usurper. In the Ukraine, it appears the US prefers diplomacy to dissuade inappropriate action. How then will the West react should Turkey's governmental system fundamentally change without popular referendum? If constitutional talks remain stalled, but unilateral changes are continued by the AKP, how will Turkey's other factions react? Immediate reforms are in progress, and the natures of Turkey's government and state are at stake. The outcomes will likely alter international relationships, and will certainly affect regional stability. What occurs during the 2014 and 2015 Turkish elections may affect U.S. foreign policy in the region for decades to come.

---

[248] "The Rise of Income Inequality amongst Rich Countries," Inequality Watch, February 2012, http://inequalitywatch.eu/spip.php?article58.

[249] "Obama's Erdogan Predicament," *Al-Monitor*, accessed March 2, 2014, http://www.al-monitor.com/pulseen/originals/2014/02/officials-urge-obama-speak-out-erdogan-anti-democratic.html.

[250] "Washington Warns Moscow to Change Course on Ukraine or Face Economic Consequences," *Euronews*, accessed March 6, 2014, http://www.euronews.com/2014/03/04/washington-warns-moscow-to-change-course-on-ukraine-or-face-economic-/.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

LIST OF REFERENCES

"Accession Criteria (Copenhagen Criteria)." Accessed July 29, 2014.
http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/glossary/accession_criteria_copenhague_en.htm.

"Adding Injustice to Injury: One Year on from the Gezi Park Protests in Turkey."
Amnesty International, 2014.
http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/info/EUR44/010/2014/en.

Akyol, Mustafa. "Turkey's Doctrine of Pre-Emptive Authoritarianism." *Al-Monitor*.
April 10, 2014. http://www.al-monitor.com/pulse/originals/2014/04/authoritarian-turkey-preemptive-erdogan.html.

Arango, Tim. "Corruption Scandal Is Edging Near Turkish Premier." *The New York Times*, December 25, 2013, sec. World / Europe.
http://www.nytimes.com/2013/12/26/world/europe/turkish-cabinet-members-resign.html.

———. "Turkish Leader Disowns Trials That Helped Him Tame Military." *The New York Times*, February 26, 2014.
http://www.nytimes.com/2014/02/27/world/europe/turkish-leader-disowns-trials-that-helped-him-tame-military.html.

Arjomand, Said Amir. *From Nationalism to Revolutionary Islam*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1984.

Arsu, Sebnem, and Dan Bilefsky. "Turkey Lifts Longtime Ban on Head Scarves in State Offices." *The New York Times*, October 8, 2013, sec. World / Europe.
http://www.nytimes.com/2013/10/09/world/europe/turkey-lifts-ban-on-head-scarves-in-state-offices.html.

Bilgin, Fevzi. *Constitution, Legitimacy and Democracy in Turkey*. SSRN Scholarly Paper. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network, January 1, 2008.
http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=1564920.

Bozarslan, Hamit. *Violence in the Middle East*. Princeton: Markus Weiner Publishers, 2004.

Çarkoglu, Ali, and Ersin Kalaycioglu. *Turkish Democracy Today: Elections, Protest and Stability in an Islamic Society*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2007.
site.ebrary.com/lib/nps/docDetail.action?docID=10178011.

"Chapter 6—Terrorist Organizations." In *Country Reports of Terrorism*. U.S. Department of State, Office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism. April 30, 2008. http://m.state.gov/md103714.htm.

Cizre, Ümit. "A New Politics of Engagement: The Turkish Military, Society, and the AKP." In *Democracy, Islam, and Secularism in Turkey*, edited by Ahmet Kuru and Alfred Stepan, 122–48. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.

"Constitution of the Republic of Turkey," November 7, 1982. http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/3ae6b5be0.html.

"Constitution of the Republic of Turkey." Turkiye Buyuk Millet Meclisi. Accessed June 27, 2014. http://global.tbmm.gov.tr/docs/constitution_en.pdf.

Cook, Steven A. *Ruling but Not Governing: The Military and Political Development in Egypt, Algeria, and Turkey*. Baltimore: JHU Press, 2007.

"Corruption Scandal in Turkey:PM Erdogan Fires Hundreds of Police Officers and Chiefs / Breaking News." National Turk. Accessed March 8, 2014. http://www.nationalturk.com/en/corruption-scandal-in-turkeypm-erdogan-fires-hundreds-of-police-officers-and-chiefs-breaking-news-45919.

Cotran, Eugene, and Mai Yamani, eds. *The Rule of Law in the Middle East and the Islamic World Human Rights and the Judicial Process*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2000.

"Declaration of Independence—Text Transcript." Accessed July 30, 2014. http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/declaration_transcript.html.

Department, Attorney-General's. "Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK)." Accessed May 9, 2014. http://www.nationalsecurity.gov.au/Listedterroristorganisations/Pages/KurdistanWorkersPartyPKK.aspx.

Diamond, Larry. "The Rule of Law Versus the Big Man." *Journal of Democracy* 19, no. 2 (2008): 138–49.

Dockterman, Eliana. "Turkey Bans Twitter." *Time*. March 20, 2014. http://time.com/32864/turkey-bans-twitter/.

Duckitt, John. "Authoritarianism and Group Identification: A New View of an Old Construct." *Political Psychology* 10, no. 1 (1989): 63–84.

Earle, Edward. "The New Constitution of Turkey." *Political Science Quarterly* 40, no. 1 (1925): 76–88.

"First-Past-the-Post." Electoral Reform Society. Accessed March 7, 2014. http://www.electoral-reform.org.uk/first-past-the-post/.

"Former Turkish General Gets Life in Prison for Erdogan Overthrow Conspiracy." *NBC News*, August 5, 2013. http://www.nbcnews.com/news/world/former-turkish-general-gets-life-prison-erdogan-overthrow-conspiracy-v19876424.

Gönenç, Levent. "The 2001 Amendments to the 1982 Constitution of Turkey." *Ankara Law Review* 1, no. 1 (2004): 89–109.

Hale, William. *Turkish Politics and the Military*. Oxon, England: Routledge, 1994.

Hale, William, and Ergun Özbudun. *Islamism, Democracy and Liberalism in Turkey: The Case of the AKP*. Oxon, England: Routledge, 2010.

Huntington, Samuel. *Political Order in Changing Societies*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1968.

Janowitz, Morris. *Military Institutions and Coercion in the Developing Nations*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1977.

Jenkins, Gareth. *Context and Circumstance: The Turkish Military and Politics*. Adelphi Paper. Oxon, England: Routledge, 2001.

John Locke. "An Essay Concerning Human Understanding." 1690. http://www2.hn.psu.edu/faculty/jmanis/locke/humanund.pdf.

John M. Vanderlippe. *The Politics of Turkish Democracy: Ismet Inonu and the Formation of the Multi-Party System, 1938–1950*. Albany: New York State University Press, 2005.

Karpat, Kemal. *Social Change and Politics in Turkey: A Structural-Historical Analysis*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1973.

Kogacioglu, Dicle. "Dissolution of Political Parties by the Constitutional Court in Turkey Judicial Delimitation of the Political Domain." *International Sociology* 18, no. 1 (2003): 258–76. doi:10.1177/0268580903018001014.

Kumbaracibasi, Arda Can. *Turkish Politics and the Rise of the AKP: Dilemmas of Institutionalization and Leadership Strategy*. Oxon, England: Routledge, 2009.

"Kurdistan Worker's Party (PKK)." Terrorist Organization Profiles. Accessed May 8, 2014. http://www.start.umd.edu/tops/terrorist_organization_profile.asp?id=63.

Kuru, Ahmet, and Alfred Stepan, eds. *Democracy, Islam, and Secularism in Turkey*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.

———. "Laicite as an 'Ideal Type' and a Continuum: Comparing Turkey, France, and Senegal." In *Democracy, Islam, and Secularism in Turkey*, 95–121. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.

Lagendijk, Joost. "Turkey's Accession to the European Union and the Role of the Justice and Development Party." In *Democracy, Islam, and Secularism in Turkey*, edited by Ahmet Kuru and Alfred Stepan, 166–88. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.

Levent Gonenc. *2010 Proposed Constitutional Amendments to the 1982 Constitution of Turkey*. Economic Policy Research Foundation of Turkey, September 2010.

Levitsky, Steven, and Lucan Way. "Elections without Democracy: The Rise of Competitive Authoritarianism." *Journal of Democracy* 13, no. 2 (2002): 51–65.

Linz, Juan. *Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 2000.

"Not so Good for You." *The Economist*, June 1, 2013. http://www.economist.com/news/europe/21578657-mildly-islamist-government-brings-tough-alcohol-restrictions-not-so-good-you.

"Obama's Erdogan Predicament." *Al-Monitor*. Accessed March 2, 2014. http://www.al-monitor.com/pulseen/originals/2014/02/officials-urge-obama-speak-out-erdogan-anti-democratic.html.

Özbudun, Ergun. *Democratization and the Politics of Constitution-Making in Turkey*. Central European University Press, 2009.

———. "The Turkish Constitutional Court and Political Crisis." In *Democracy, Islam, and Secularism in Turkey*, edited by Ahmet Kuru and Alfred Stepan, 149–65. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.

———. "Turkey-Plural Society and Monolithic State." In *Democracy, Islam, and Secularism in Turkey*, edited by Ahmet Kuru and Alfred Stepan. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.

Özpek, Burak Bilgehan. "Constitution-Making in Turkey after the 2011 Elections." *Turkish Studies* 13, no. 2 (2012): 153–67. doi:10.1080/14683849.2012.685253.

Pamuk, Humeyra, and Nick Tattersall. "Erdogan Targets Enemies after Poll Triumph." Reuters. March 31, 2014. http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/03/31/us-turkey-election-idUSBREA2R12X20140331.

Perlmutter, Amos. *Modern Authoritarianism: A Comparative Institutional Analysis*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1981.

Philip Gailey. "Turkey: Islam in a Secular Society," May 27, 2007. http://www.sptimes.com/2007/05/27/news_pf/Opinion/Turkey__Islam_in_a_se.shtml.

"Politics—Turkish PM Hints at Presidential Run, as Ruling AKP Maintains Decisions." *Hurriyet Daily News*. May, 2014. http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/turkish-pm--hints-at-presidential-run-as-ruling-akp-maintains-decisions.aspx?pageID=238&nID=65931&NewsCatID=338.

"Reports of Turkey's Authoritarianism Are Not Greatly Exaggerated." opendemocracy. Accessed April 27, 2014. http://www.opendemocracy.net/arab-awakening/cemal-burak-tansel/reports-of-turkey%E2%80%99s-authoritarianism-are-not-greatly-exaggerated.

Rubin, Barry, and Metìn Heper, eds. *Political Parties in Turkey*. London: Frank Cass and Company Limited, 2002.

Rustow, Dankwart. "The Modernization of Turkey in Historical and Comparative Perspective." In *Social Change and Politics in Turkey: A Structural-Historical Analysis*, edited by Kemal Karpat, 93–122. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1973.

Schumann, Christoph. *Liberal Thought in the Eastern Mediterranean Late 19th Century until the 1960s: Social, Economic, and Political Studies of the Middle East and Asia*. Boston: Brill, 2008.

Solaker, Gulsen. "Hopes Fade for a New Turkish Constitution." Reuters. November 18, 2013. http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/11/18/us-turkey-constitution-idUSBRE9AH0OV20131118.

Solt, Frederick. "The Social Origins of Authoritarianism." *Political Research Quarterly* 65, no. 4 (2012): 703–13.

Stellmacher, Jost, and Thomas Petzel. "Authoritarianism as a Group Phenomenon." *Political Psychology: Authoritarianism*, 26, no. 2 (2005): 245–74.

"The Republican Era Constitutions." Accessed March 5, 2014. http://www.mfa.gov.tr/constitution-of-the-republic-of-turkey.en.mfa#bm2.

"The Rise of Income Inequality amongst Rich Countries." Inequality Watch. February 6, 2012. http://inequalitywatch.eu/spip.php?article58.

Tisdall, Simon. "Turkey's Sledgehammer Coup Verdict: Justice or Soviet-Style Show Trial?" *The Guardian*, September 25, 2012, sec. Comment is free. http://www.theguardian.com/world/2012/sep/25/turkey-sledgehammer-coup-trial-verdict.

"Turkey Retires 40 'Coup Plot' Generals." *BBC News*. Accessed March 8, 2014.
    http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-19127708.

"Turkey Warns YouTube and Facebook Could Be Banned." *The Express Tribune with
    the International New York Times*. Accessed June 18, 2014.
    http://tribune.com.pk/story/680033/turkey-warns-youtube-and-facebook-could-
    be-banned/.

"Turkey's Fading Democracy." *Huffington Post*, February 10, 2014.
    http://www.huffingtonpost.com/alp-aslandogan/turkeys-fading-
    democracy_b_4733996.html.

"Turkey's President Signs Law Giving Government More Power over Judiciary."
    Euronews. February 27, 2014. http://www.euronews.com/2014/02/27/turkey-s-
    president-signs-law-giving-government-more-power-over-judiciary/.

"Turkish Party Disputes Local Election Results." Bigstory AP, April 1, 2014.
    http://bigstory.ap.org/article/turkish-party-disputes-local-election-results.

"Turkish President Signs Controversial Internet Legislation." *Al-Monitor*. Accessed June
    13, 2014. http://www.al-monitor.com/pulse/originals/2014/02/gul-signs-
    controversial-internet-bill.html.

Volpi, Frédéric. "Pseudo-democracy in the Muslim World." *Third World Quarterly* 25,
    no. 6 (2004): 1061–78. doi:10.1080/0143659042000256896.

"Washington Warns Moscow to Change Course on Ukraine or Face Economic
    Consequences." *Euronew*s. Accessed March 6, 2014.
    http://www.euronews.com/2014/03/04/washington-warns-moscow-to-change-
    course-on-ukraine-or-face-economic-/.

Weinthal, Erika, and Pauline Luong. "An Alternative Solution to Managing Mineral
    Wealth." *Perspectives on Politics* 4, no. 1 (2006): 35–53.

"What Is the Rule of Law? The World Justice Project," May 9, 2012.
    http://www.worldjusticeproject.org/what-rule-law.

White, Jenny. *Islamist Mobilization in Turkey: A Study in Vernacular Politics*. Seattle,
    WA: University of Washington Press, 2002.

Wink, Paul, Michele Dillon, and Adrienne Prettyman. "Religiousness, Spiritual Seeking,
    and Authoritarianism: Findings from a Longitudinal Study." *Journal for the
    Scientific Study of Religion* 46, no. 3 (2007): 321–35.

Yavuz, Hakan. *Secularism and Muslim Democracy in Turkey*. Cambridge: Cambridge
    University Press, 2009.

Yesilada, Birol. "The Virtue Party." In *Political Parties in Turkey*, edited by Barry Rubin and Metìn Heper, 62–81. London: Frank Cass and Company Limited, 2002.

Zürcher, Erik. *Turkey: A Modern History*. 3rd ed. London: I.B. Tauris, 2004.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1. Defense Technical Information Center
    Ft. Belvoir, Virginia

2. Dudley Knox Library
    Naval Postgraduate School
    Monterey, California